THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXLVIII.] APRIL, 1857. [Vol. XIII.

IGNATIUS, BISHOP OF ANTIOCH—HIS MARTYRDOM AND EPISTLES.*

Antioch, the capital of the Grecian kingdom of Syria and of the Roman province of the same name, was one of the most flourishing, and at the same time the most luxurious and corrupt, of the great cities of the East. Seleucus Nicator, who founded it and called it after his father Antiochus, had shewn not less discernment in the selection of its site, than his illustrious chief in the foundation of Alexandria. The Orontes, on the banks of which it stands, rising, like the Jordan and the rivers of Damascus, in the vicinity of Libanus and Antilibanus, and being fed during the summer by the melting of their snows, is a perennial stream and not a mere summer torrent, like so many which appear as rivers on the maps of Phœnicia and Palestine. Its climate is tempered by the vicinity of the mountains, Casius on the south, Taurus and Amanus on the north. By means of the harbour of Seleucia Pieria at the mouth of the Orontes, it had a ready communication with Egypt, Asia Minor, and all the Western world. Being situated in the latitude where the Euphrates makes a great bend towards the Mediterranean, it afforded the shortest and easiest communication between the West and the East. A government very different from the Turkish secured the navigation of the river to the Persian Gulf, and through this channel the merchandize of India was brought to the markets of Antioch. If the Euphrates route should be resumed, as seems not improbable, Suedieh and Antakia will become as important points on the line as their ancient representatives, Seleucia and Antioch.

Antioch was the smallest of the three great cities which the Macedonians founded in the East, its population not equalling that of Alexandria or Seleucia on the Tigris, but it probably

* 1. The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians and the Romans. Edited, with an English Translation and Notes, by William Cureton, M.A. London. 1845.

2. Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, or the Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, as exhibited in the Ancient Syriac Version, vindicated from the Charge of Heresy. By William Cureton, M.A. London. 1846.

3. Corpus Ignatianum: a Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, Genuine, Interpolated and Spurious, in Syriac, Greek and Latin; an English Translation of the Syriac Text, copious Notes and an Introduction. By William Cureton, M.A., F.R.S., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen. 1849.

amounted to upwards of 200,000. The seats of commerce in ancient times, especially if they were also seaports, like Naucratis, Corinth and Gades, were usually noted for profligacy of manners, and the Syrian cities were especially remarkable for the cultivation of those arts by which the manly energies of character are relaxed. Roman patriots traced the first decay of national virtue to the conquest of Asia (Liv. xxxix. 6), and Juvenal pointedly refers to the evil influence of Antioch, when he complains (Sat. iii. 62) that "the Syrian Orontes had flowed into the Tiber." Terrible earthquakes repeatedly overthrew large portions of the city, but like the Neapolitans, who sing and dance and feast over the crust of a volcano, they intermitted nothing of their devotion to luxury and amusement, but rebuilt their city from its ruins in greater splendour than before, and seemed only excited by the precariousness of life to its more sensual enjoyment.

Like Corinth, Antioch is early distinguished in the history of the Christian church. Its Macedonian sovereigns had encouraged the settlement of the Jews here as at Alexandria (Jos. c. Ap. ii. 4), and indeed without special encouragement this people was sure to be found in all the busy centres of the world's commerce, at first facilitating, afterwards obstructing, the diffusion of the gospel. To them alone (Acts xi. 19) it was first preached, when the disciples were scattered from Jerusalem upon the persecution that arose about Stephen; but its preaching was soon and successfully extended to the Greek population. When tidings of this success reached the ears of the church in Jerusalem, Barnabas was commissioned to visit Antioch, and he soon joined with himself Paul, who was now at Tarsus, waiting apparently till the time should come* when he might preach the gospel of the uncircumcision. Peter, to whom the gospel of the circumcision had been committed, had by this time been convinced by his vision that God had granted also to the Gentiles repentance unto life, and Paul, obeying the invitation of Barnabas, came with him to Antioch. Here first the disciples of Jesus, instead of the "sect of the Nazarenes," obtained the name of Christians (Acts xi. 26),—a change which marks the transition of the gospel from a reformed Judaism into a religion for humanity. Antioch continued to be the centre of Paul's missionary labours till the vision of Troas opened to him a new field in Europe.

From this time we lose sight of the church of Antioch for half a century. Peter is said by Eusebius to have been its first bishop, Euodius the second, and Ignatius the third. When he was ordained to this office is not certain, probably in the latter part of the first century, so that he may have personally known the evangelist and apostle John. The tradition that he had seen the Saviour and was the child whom he took in his arms when

---

* See C. R. Vol. IX. pp. 415, 416.

he reproved his disciples for their want of humility, is founded on his epithet Theophorus (Θεοφόρος), which means "one who carries God with him," but if accented Θεόφορος, "one whom God carries." He was a man, according to the Acts of his Martyrdom, of great piety, a wise ruler of the church, and one who, by prayer and fasting and assiduous teaching, endeavoured to strengthen the church and prevent the weak from being overpowered by temptation. But he was not satisfied with the performance of these duties, thinking that he should never attain the rank of a perfect disciple except through the medium of martyrdom. The persecution by Domitian, in the year 95 A.D., occurred during his episcopate, but it fell chiefly on the Christians of Rome. In the beginning of the reign of Trajan, however, as we find from the correspondence between him and Pliny,* who was then proprætor of Bithynia, the Christians of that province were suffering from a violent persecution, not originating with the government, but rather forced upon it by the enemies of the Christians. As their numbers in that province were so great that both towns and country districts were "infected with the superstition," and that the temples had been nearly deserted by their worshipers, it is probable that in Antioch, the cradle of Christianity, the zeal and number of the Christians and the animosity of their enemies would be even greater. According to the Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius,† Trajan, having conquered the Dacians and the Scythians and various other nations, bethought himself that he might perhaps forfeit the favour of the gods and lose the power which he had acquired, unless he could compel the Christians to sacrifice to idols, and proposed to them the option of death or sacrifice. He had come to Antioch, in the ninth year of his reign, on his way to attack the Parthians, and Ignatius, who as we have seen was burning with eagerness to win the crown of martyrdom, was summoned before him, when the following dialogue took place in the presence of the senate:

Trajan. Are thou he that is called Theophorus, who settest at nought our commands, and turnest all Antioch upside down, and makest all men to be followers of the Christ whom thou preachest, and dost not deem the gods to be worthy even of the name?

Ignatius. I am he.

Traj. And what is *Theophorus?*

Ign. He who carries about Christ in his soul.

Traj. And dost thou then carry about Christ in thyself?

Ign. Certainly; for it is written, "God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them." (2 Cor. vi. 16.)

Traj. And do not we seem to thee to remember the gods continually, and always to bear them about in our soul, inducing them to become our coadjutors against our enemies, and by their means succeeding in everything according to our wishes?

* Ep. x. 97.

† Cotelerius, pp. Apostol. ii. 161, foll.

Ign. Alas, O King, that thou shouldst call the idols of the heathens, gods! There is one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth and all things therein, and one Christ Jesus, the only-begotten Son of God, of whose kingdom there is no end. Wouldst thou acknowledge Him, O King, thy purple and thy diadem and thy royal throne would be far more secure to thee.

Traj. Enough of this! If thou art willing, O Ignatius, to pay a great compliment to my power, and in future to be reckoned among my friends, change thy mind and sacrifice to the gods with us, and forthwith, know all men, I will make thee High-priest of Jupiter and name thee Father of the Senate.

Ignatius having declined the offer, inasmuch as he was already a priest of Christ, to whom he offered daily the sacrifice of praise, and to whom he desired to offer up himself as a whole victim, Trajan charges him with being beside himself, and the saint waxing bolder replied, "If thou shalt consume me by wild beasts, or condemn me to the cross, or give me up to sword and fire, never will I sacrifice to demons."

The senate here interposes, and, as Ignatius had spoken of Christ as dying for him, reproaches him with acknowledging that his God had died, whereas gods were by their nature immortal. Hereupon Ignatius retorts that his Lord and God Jesus Christ had died for the salvation of mankind, whereas their gods were worthless men, and winds up his harangue by enumerating the proofs of their mortality. Jupiter's tomb was shewn in Crete; Æsculapius was killed by a thunderbolt; Venus was buried at Paphos, and Hercules consumed on a funeral pyre. The emperor and the senate were now alarmed lest, if they allowed him to speak any more, the falsehood of heathenism should be exposed and the people converted to the truth; and they ordered him to be put in chains. Having spent the whole night in considering how he might be adequately punished, Trajan determined that he should be exposed to wild beasts; but when he communicated his determination to the senate, they represented that if his martyrdom took place in Antioch it would only make him more glorious in the eyes of the people, and that he should be carried in chains to Rome, there to be exposed to the wild beasts, where he would only be known as a malefactor.

The absurdity of this story, which represents Trajan as bandying arguments with a Christian, and promising to make him High-priest of Jupiter and Father of the Senate, is palpable. It might be said indeed that the fictitious character of the dialogue does not necessarily imply the falsehood of the story, since the ancients allowed themselves great latitude in embellishing history by means of oratory and dialogue. But it is nearly certain that Trajan was not at Antioch, nor in any part of Asia, at this time. His victory over the Dacians, when he triumphed for a second time, took place A.D. 106, the ninth of his reign;

the Latin account of the martyrdom of Ignatius fixes it to the consulship of Senecio and Sura, which from the Fasti (see Zumpt's Annales sub. an.) we know fell in the year 107. But it was not till 114 that Trajan went into the East on that expedition against the Parthians from which he never returned to Italy. The consulship of Suranus and Marcellus, to which the Oxford MS. of the Martyrdom, quoted by Archbishop Usher (Cotelerius pp. Apost. ii. 169), refers the death of Ignatius, carries us still further back, as it fell A.D. 104, the very year when Trajan was on the Danube. It is true that from the year 106, when he returned from Dacia, to 114, there is almost an entire blank in his history. This is naturally accounted for if he remained during that time at Rome, engaged in the civil duties of his office; but history could not have been silent if such an important event as a journey to the East had taken place in this interval. The year 104 brings us nearer to the time when the persecution of the Christians raged in Bithynia, as 103 is the probable date of Pliny's letter and Trajan's rescript. But whether we assume 104 or 107 for the martyrdom of Ignatius, it is equally evident that the account of the interview and dialogue of the emperor and the martyr *at Antioch* is pure fiction. The fact, however, of his being taken to Rome and there exposed to wild beasts admits of no doubt, and the motive assigned for his transmission to the metropolis, that he would suffer there obscurely and without sympathy, is a very probable one. Eusebius, in his Chronicon, places his death in 110, but says nothing of his being condemned by Trajan.

From Antioch he was conveyed, under the custody of ten Roman soldiers, to Seleucia, the harbour of the city, distant about twenty miles, and there put on board a vessel which conveyed him to Smyrna. From Smyrna he sailed to Troas, and thence to Neapolis (Acts xvi. 11) and Philippi. From Philippi he went by land to Epidamnus, in Epirus; but instead of crossing from this point to Italy, he was taken by sea to Puteoli. It was his earnest desire to have landed here, and to have followed the footsteps of the apostle Paul to Rome; but a violent wind arose, which carried the ship in a day and a night to the port which the emperor Claudius had constructed at the mouth of the Tiber. The news of his approach had reached the brethren at Rome, and they came to meet him and accompanied him to the capital. In the Latin narrative of his martyrdom, the narrators use *nos* and *nobis* after the mention of Puteoli, as if some of the brethren had accompanied him at least from this place. He arrived in Rome at the close of the year, near the time of the celebration of the Saturnalia. Among the other amusements of the people at this season of festivity and licence, was the exhibition of combats between gladiators or malefactors and wild beasts, and Ignatius was brought into the arena and exposed to the lions.

Doubt has been thrown on the narrative of his journey from Smyrna to Rome, as if it were improbable that he should have been taken by so circuitous a route, instead of being conveyed at once by sea from Asia Minor to Italy. The motive assigned by the historian of his martyrdom is, that he might be worn out by the fatigues of the journey, and induced to make the necessary submission. The same history represents him as making something like a triumphal progress, visiting the churches everywhere on the way, teaching and exhorting, confirming the weak, and making all watchful and sober. It does not seem very probable that the Roman soldiers, in whose custody he was, should have allowed him thus ostentatiously to profess the faith for which he had been condemned, and encourage others in similar obstinacy. The centurion under whose charge Paul was conveyed to Rome "courteously entreated him, and gave him liberty to go unto his friends" (Acts xxvii. 3); but Paul was not going as a condemned criminal; he was an appellant to Cæsar, and a Roman citizen; and Ignatius, in one of the Epistles whose genuineness is not disputed, calls the soldiers who guarded him *ten leopards*, and says that he has been *fighting with beasts* all the way from Smyrna to Rome. It would not, however, be safe to question the fact of his circuitous journey merely on the ground of its improbability, as we know not what other business the Roman soldiers may have had besides the safe convoy of Ignatius. Otherwise a critic of the Straussian school might allege that the journey by Troas, Neapolis, Philippi, Illyricum and Puteoli, had been devised in order to assimilate Ignatius to Paul, in whose history all these places are mentioned.

When he was brought into the arena,—the theatre being filled with people, whose curiosity had been excited, say the Acts of his Martyrdom, by the rumour that a Syrian bishop was about to fight with wild beasts,—turning to the people, he said, "Romans and spectators of this contest, I suffer this not on account of any crime, but that I may attain to God, for whom I long with insatiable desire. I am his wheat, and I am to be ground by the teeth of lions that I may become his pure bread." That Ignatius should be allowed to address the people is not very probable, and the sentence here put into his mouth is in fact a part of his Epistle to the Romans. The lions being let loose upon him devoured all but the larger bones, thus accomplishing his desire that they might be his sepulchre; and after the spectators had dispersed, the believers gathered these up and deposited them in a place without the city, on which they set a mark, and from which they were afterwards conveyed to Antioch. The Christians of Rome were inconsolable for his loss, but he appeared to them in their sleep, and, according to one account, soothed the violence of their grief; according to another, shewed himself streaming with sweat, like an athlete who had just passed

victoriously through a conflict which had tried his strength to the utmost.

Legends, like snowballs, gather increase as they roll, and by the time the legend of the martyrdom of Ignatius reached Venerable Bede in the seventh century, it had received some marvellous additions. When brought before Trajan and the senate, he was first of all beaten on the shoulder-blades with leaden pestles, then his sides were torn with hooks and rubbed with rough stones, his hands filled with burning papyrus steeped in oil, and his body stretched over a charcoal fire. Vinegar and salt having been rubbed into his wounds, he was kept three days without food or drink, and again brought out before Trajan and the Roman people. Being bound, he was exposed to two lions, who rushed on him and strangled him, but did not touch his flesh.

There is very early evidence that Ignatius had written Epistles to individuals and churches, some even while he was on his journey to Rome. The Epistle of Polycarp, himself a martyr, to the Philippians, is mutilated in the Greek; but in the Latin, which is confirmed by Eusebius, he mentions a letter or letters addressed by Ignatius both to himself and to the Philippians. Irenæus quotes the saying of Ignatius, that "he was the wheat of Christ," &c., but does not expressly say that he quoted it from an Epistle, and we have seen that he was traditionally reported to have *spoken* these words in the arena. Theophilus Antiochenus,* assigning the reasons why Christ should have been born, "non ex simplici virgine sed ex desponsata," mentions as the fourth, "ut partus ejus falleret diabolum, putantem Jesum de uxorata, non de virgine natum;" and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. xix., Ignatius says, "the virginity of Mary escaped the knowledge of the Ruler of this world," which indeed may be a coincidence rather than a quotation, as the name of Ignatius is not mentioned. Origen, however, clearly quotes the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians for this saying; and therefore when he alleges a saying of the same martyr respecting Christ, "Meus amor crucifixus est," which is found in the Epistle to the Romans, the natural inference is that he quoted a written document and not merely a traditionary story. We have thus proof of the existence of Epistles to Polycarp and the Philippians in the lifetime of Ignatius, and of an Epistle to the Romans and the Ephesians in the time of Origen. And these two circumstances united make it probable that the coincidences noticed in Irenæus and Theophilus indicate their knowledge of writings of the martyr.

The testimony of Eusebius is much more ample. He says (Hist. Eccl. iii. c. 36) that Ignatius, as he travelled towards Rome in the custody of the soldiers, not only exhorted the churches everywhere in Asia and warned them against the here-

* Cureton, Corp. Ign. p. 156.

sies which were springing up, but for greater security wrote Epistles to them, which might be handed down to posterity. Thus from Smyrna he wrote to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, to the Romans, to Polycarp, to the Smyrnæans; and, from the quotations and allusions, there can be no doubt that in the age of Eusebius the Epistles existed in the same state as they have come down to us, waving for the present the inquiry which of the several texts is the most pure. Jerome adds the Epistle to the Philadelphians. It is unnecessary to pursue any further the chain of evidence, which Mr. Cureton prolongs to the time of Photius.*

The first publication of the Epistles of Ignatius, after the invention of printing, took place in 1495, when they appeared in Latin as an Appendix to the Life of the Martyr of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket. Among them were two Epistles of Ignatius to St. John, and one to the Virgin, with her reply. Another edition in Latin was published in 1498. Besides those just mentioned and those acknowledged by Eusebius, the Latin contains Epistles to the Philadelphians, to the Antiochenes, to Hero, the deacon of Antioch, and to the Tarsians. This Latin translation is of considerable antiquity, having been quoted by a writer of the ninth century. The Greek text was first published in 1537, and this edition contained twelve Epistles, one to Maria Cassobolita being added to the eleven of the Latin. She had addressed a letter to Ignatius, to which this is an answer.

It was some time before any sound criticism was applied to the Epistles, though there was much to provoke criticism in the discrepancy between the Latin and the Greek. Bellarmin naturally contended for the authority of the Latin, which contained a correspondence between Ignatius and the Virgin Mary, and in which Anacletus is called the *papa* of Rome. The Magdeburg Centuriators, on the other hand, in their great work on Ecclesiastical History, designed to expose, century by century, the corruptions of the Romish Church, suggested many circumstances tending to throw doubts on the genuineness of the whole series. But the first author by whom the question was critically treated was Vedel, a Professor of Geneva, in 1623. While he admitted the genuineness of those only which are mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, he pointed out, even in these, many passages which he suspected on internal grounds to be spurious. Archbishop Usher made a most important advance in Ignatian criticism, by bringing to light, from libraries in England, what has since been called the Shorter Text of the Epistles, in an ancient Latin version. Two years after the publication of Usher's edition, Isaac Vossius published the Greek original of this Shorter Text, from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence. Thus the question came

* Corp. Ign. p. 189.

to have a double division—What Epistles are genuine, what wholly spurious; of the genuine themselves, what part is spurious? These were questions not easy to decide on critical grounds from the paucity of MSS., but they were soon taken out of the domain of pure criticism. The Epistles had from the first been suspected by the Protestants, on account of the high language which they hold respecting the authority of the bishop; Calvin, who rejected Episcopacy, treated them as a contemptible forgery. The dispute acquired additional bitterness in the seventeenth century from the growth of Independency and Presbyterianism in England. Though the Protestants refused to the writings of the Fathers the authority which they attributed to Scripture, they could not but feel how strong a case was made out for Episcopacy, if the plenitude of the bishop's power was recognized by a contemporary of the apostles; and if the Ignatian Epistles were genuine, this must be acknowledged. Their language is most absolute. "Let no man do anything of what belongs to the Church without the bishop." "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be." "It is not lawful without the bishop neither to baptize nor to celebrate the Holy Communion." Both in England and in France, the opponents of Episcopacy possessed in that age men fully a match in erudition and acuteness for the Cardinals, Jesuits and Bishops who defended it. Salmasius and David Blondel, who had attacked the Ignatian Epistles, were answered by Dr. Hammond. Daillé, who had earned the name of *Patromastix*, or Scourge of the Fathers, by his treatise, *Du Vray Usage des Pères*, in which he had mercilessly exposed their faults, published in 1662 a separate treatise on the Genuineness of the Writings attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, and Ignatius. Dionysius has long been abandoned by the critics; but a strenuous battle was maintained on behalf of Ignatius by Pearson, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and, in the latter part of his life, Bishop of Chester.* Pearson was one of the most learned divines whom the Church of England has produced, and qualified for the conduct of a literary controversy which had degenerated into personality, by a mildness of temper which won the admiration of Baxter when they were opposed to each other in the conferences of the Savoy. His learning, and especially his patristical learning, is immense; his reasoning close and logical. As his adversaries had denied the genuineness of the entire works of Ignatius in defiance of the testimony of antiquity, he has often the advantage over them, and improves it to the utmost. The weakest part of his work is that in which he endeavours to shew that the Episcopate, as distinct from and superior to the Presbyterate, is an apostolical institution. It was received, however, as a triumphant vindica-

* His *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* are reprinted in Le Clerc's edition of Cotelerius, Vol. II.

tion both of Ignatius and Episcopacy, and the long controversy died out with a reply from Larroque, another French Protestant minister. Its political and religious interest had ceased by the end of the seventeenth century. Presbyterianism had lost the hope of ascendancy, or even recognition by the State; Episcopacy, established by law, had no need to trouble itself about its doubtful title from apostolical tradition. Lardner, who of course had to quote Ignatius in his "Credibility," may be taken as representing the opinion in which learned and impartial men had settled.* He quotes the shorter recension as being that to which Eusebius, Jerome and Origen refer, and avails himself of its evidence in favour of the existing canon of the New Testament. He was also convinced that the larger recension had been interpolated from the smaller, not the smaller abridged from the larger. The original and independent William Whiston was almost the only eminent man who declared the opposite judgment. The longer recension contains passages of an Arian character, and was recommended to him by this circumstance, on which more orthodox critics founded a charge of interpolation. Thus, in the Epistle to the Tarsians, it is called a heresy to say that "Christ is God over all." Such passages Whiston believed that the Athanasians had struck out in the shorter recension.

We see, then, that a true *critical* basis for the discussion was wanting. Both texts existed in ancient MSS., and there was no such difference among them in age or excellence as to give exclusive authority to either. Every one therefore rejected what seemed to him inconsistent with the state of the Church or the sentiments and character of Ignatius, and retained the rest. But this test was vague and arbitrary; for the state and discipline of the Church was the very point which the Epistles were called in to decide; and unless something was first established as unquestionably of the martyr's writing, there was no standard of his style or sentiments to be appealed to. No new MS. of the Greek text had come to light since the publication of the Medicean. Archbishop Usher had entertained hopes that the discovery of a Syriac version, which he believed to exist in the Vatican, might afford the basis which he felt to be wanting. We shall relate in our next number how this hope, after repeated disappointments, has been at length fulfilled in our own time.

K.

---

* Works, Vol. II. p. 68.

MR. LONG'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE REV. J. J. TAYLER'S LETTERS.

33, Queen Anne Street, Feb. 25th, 1857.

My dear Sir,

It is with extreme reluctance that I take a part in the controversy occasioned by Mr. Tayler's letter in your number for December. Feeling, in common with all who know him, great respect and esteem for his talents, learning and character, it is painful to be called on to controvert many of the sentiments contained in his letters, which I think erroneous, and calculated to lead to very mischievous consequences. Agreeing in the far larger part of Mr. Gordon's letter, and in much of those of Mr. Prescott and Mr. Greg, the reason of my addressing you is, that none of your correspondents have done full justice to the cause of Unitarianism, which I consider another name for scriptural and rational Christianity. "What can be more important," Mr. Gordon justly asks, "in the whole circle of religious truth than the views we entertain with regard to the nature of God, and the moral principles which regulate human salvation? What can be more obligatory in connection with religious duty than the rendering of sole allegiance to Him whom we believe to be the only Object of worship?" If these just views had been a little enlarged, the object of this letter would perhaps have been attained. That object is to defend Unitarianism as the bond of union of those who adhere to it, and their distinguishing mark from the rest of the Christian world.

In commenting on the writings of Mr. Tayler, a peculiar difficulty arises from the obscurity of his language. In common with Mr. Gordon and Mr. Greg, I find much to which I cannot affix any distinct meaning. But for one passage in Mr. Tayler's letter, no ordinary reader could fail to consider a disparagement of Unitarianism to be one of the writer's objects. The following extracts may suffice to prove this assertion. He speaks of "the narrowest form of Unitarian dogmatism." He objects to "a sharply-defined Unitarianism." He calls Unitarianism "an inadequate and one-sided expression of the great object of Christian union." What immediately follows is very remarkable. "Nevertheless, I have always felt it a point of honour not to shrink from a name which labours under unjust reproach; and so long as that social injustice endures, I am willing to bear the trifling martyrdom it brings." To talk of adhering to a religious denomination by a point of honour, is language one could not have expected from one so truly and spiritually religious as the writer of the letter on which I feel it my duty to comment. But why does Mr. Tayler submit to any degree of suffering, or even to the social injustice which every Unitarian must more or less experience, but from his own conscientious conviction of the truth of

those religious opinions which constitute Unitarianism? In Mr. Tayler's last letter I find, with great pleasure, the following passage: "To prevent, at the outset, any further misconception of my opinions on another topic, let me here say, once for all, that I neither ignore nor undervalue the great doctrine of the absolute oneness and fatherly character of God. On the contrary, I regard them as all-important. The evidence for these fundamental truths seems to me unassailable, whether viewed in the light of reason, or gathered from the consenting testimony of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, or furnished by the inward witness of the human soul; and I would have them fearlessly asserted against prevailing errors, on all fitting occasions. Unitarianism in this broad sense has been from my earliest exercise of thought on religion, and still is, the object of my firmest belief; and, now on the verge of sixty, I hope and believe it will remain an inward source of strength and peace to my dying day." I hail with joy this unqualified adherence of the excellent writer to that form of religion which I firmly believe to be the faith once delivered to the saints. But will Mr. Tayler allow me to say, that this is the very same sharply-defined Unitarianism, the same Unitarian dogmatism, of which he complains in his former letter. I do not know what is meant by Unitarianism in its broad sense. I am only aware of one sense which attaches to it. It recognizes one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. But of this more hereafter. If I understand Mr. Tayler, his objections to Unitarianism arise from certain philosophical opinions which some of its most eminent professors have connected with it. On this head I am happy entirely to agree with him; and I shall endeavour to shew that such a connexion is highly to be blamed, and that it has been most injurious in its consequences. The objection of Mr. Tayler seems to be rather to the word Unitarian than to its signification. I cannot congratulate him on the ally whom he has brought forward in his last letter. He informs us that "the poet Rogers, who never disowned his Presbyterian descent, nor ceased to the last to speak of himself as a Dissenter, was accustomed to observe, as I have learned from a near connection, that he had marked the gradual decline of our churches in social influence and position from the day that they took the name of Unitarian." I would fain be informed to whom Rogers spoke of himself as a Dissenter. Some of his near relations are Dissenters, and to them, I presume, he assumed that name. Whether he did so to the fashionable society and the literary celebrities with whom he lived, I have no means of knowing; but for a very large portion of his long life he attended no Dissenting worship, nor am I aware of any act by which he identified himself with any class of Dissenters. If he did so, I shall be glad to be informed of the fact. In one thing I am sure to concur with Mr. Tayler, that we are not to adopt

any form of religion from a regard to social influence and position. We have higher views and objects. With respect to the decay of the Presbyterians, I am fully satisfied that if they had not adopted Unitarianism, or some other specific doctrines, they would long ago have ceased to exist.

It is time to turn our consideration to Mr. Tayler's principle of religious union. He tell us it is "the acceptance of the life of Christ as the type of our own—the realization of human righteousness, transforming our lives into a likeness with itself, not through the intellectual apprehension of any doctrines taught by him, or through a scrupulous imitation of the outward forms of his earthly life, but through deep, spiritual sympathy with its indwelling power of faith and love, filling our souls with holy peace and steadfast trust, and making us capable of daily self-sacrifice in the work of obedience." This, he tells us, is "the true point of union for a Christian church, the central principle and aim which makes it properly Christian." This passage is so obscurely expressed as to leave me uncertain whether I fully understand its meaning. If its purport is that we are bound as Christians to imitate the example of Christ, I heartily accede to it; and it may perhaps be conceded that this obligation may be properly considered as the point or bond of union of *the* Christian church, considered as one body, and comprising all who believe in Christ and submit themselves to his authority, to whatever church or sect they may belong. It cannot, however, be the bond of union of any particular section of the Christian church, since it belongs equally to all. By whatever name it is to be called, Mr. Tayler is attached to a particular division of the Christian church, and the inquiry in hand is, how it is to be distinguished from other churches. The rejection of the claims of the Church of Rome to decide on matters of faith, and the right of private judgment in religion, were the principles of the Reformation. The Reformers soon abandoned their own principles, and the Established Church in this country having assumed the like powers with the Church of Rome, the right of private judgment affords a just ground for Protestant Dissent. Not that this was the real ground with the largest division of the Dissenters. The Presbyterians were quite as exacting and intolerant as the Episcopalians. To the Independents belongs the honour of being the first religious sect which fully admitted the right of private judgment. Whether their subsequent conduct has been consistent with that principle, it is no business of mine to inquire. By degrees, a liberal spirit arose among the Presbyterians; and in the early part of the 18th century they advanced so far as to deny the authority of all creeds formed by fallible men, and to acknowledge the Scriptures alone as the rule of faith. Free inquiry was now permitted and practised; and a peculiar state of things occurred,

which could by possibility last only a short time. Calvinism had been the doctrine of the early Presbyterians; but when the ministers became free to judge for themselves, a large portion of them soon deflected from that (as it has been justly called) *heart-withering* system of doctrines. At first Arianism, and a little later Unitarianism, began to prevail among them. A change in the sentiments of their congregations no doubt took place to some extent; but they could not be expected to keep pace, nor did they, with their ministers. The teachers could therefore only by slow degrees, and with a caution not merely justifiable, but called for by the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed, instil into the minds of their hearers the opinions which they had formed on inquiry and reflection. This, if the doctrines had been merely speculative, might possibly have attained a permanency, or at least have lasted for a considerable time; but when the ministers had reached Unitarianism, a practical difficulty of the most important nature arose—no less than a difference as to the Object of religious worship. Those who rejected the doctrines of the deity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit could not of course offer up prayers to God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, believing as they did that no such beings existed. One of three things, then, must necessarily have occurred. Either the worship must have been Trinitarian, to which the Unitarians could not assent,—or Unitarian, which Trinitarians would not allow,—or sometimes one and sometimes the other, which surely no sober-minded and religious man could approve. A separation between Trinitarians and Unitarians, then, is inevitable, and an attempt to unite them deserves no better name than a religious mockery. At the same time that this great change of religious doctrine was going on among the Presbyterian Dissenters, a large body of the clergymen of the Church of England, and many of the laymen of the same communion, felt aggrieved by the Articles of that Church, and attempts were unsuccessfully made in Parliament to relieve the clergy from subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles. Several clergymen had embraced Unitarian opinions; and in the year 1774, Theophilus Lindsey, a highly-respected clergyman, resigned a valuable living and opened a chapel in Essex Street expressly as a Unitarian place of worship. Unitarianism made great advances among the Presbyterians, and prevailed in the far greater number of their congregations at least, if not in all; and the name Unitarian came into general use and seemed likely to supersede the old denomination of Presbyterian, till the Lady Hewley case, and the subsequent attempts by the so-called orthodox to deprive the Unitarian congregations of their places of worship, rendered it expedient for them, in the just defence of their property, to call themselves by their original, although inappropriate, name.

For a long time the word Unitarian has been used as the de-

signation of a particular division of the Christian Church. A Unitarian Book Society was founded in the latter part of the last century, then followed the Unitarian Fund, and both were absorbed in the Unitarian Association. Your miscellany has for its second title, Unitarian Magazine and Review. It is only lately that the term has been held objectionable. Let us now see whether sufficient reasons have been brought forward to induce us to abandon it.

It is proper to make a few previous remarks on two words much used in your pages, "creed" and "unsectarian." It seems to be considered by many that we ought to be mainly distinguished by two negatives; we are to be unsectarian and we are to have no creed. The ambiguity of language is a great blessing to all lovers of dispute and controversy. If disputants fully understood each other's meaning, the far larger part of existing controversies would come to an end. If by "unsectarian" be meant that we should extirpate all unkind and illiberal feelings towards those who differ with us in opinion,—that we should refrain from glorification of ourselves on the ground of the supposed correctness of our opinions, or depreciation of others for their supposed errors,—then indeed being unsectarian is to be approved of and commended; but if we are to understand by the term that it prohibits an attachment to the opinions we profess, firm in proportion to the strength of our convictions and to our sense of the importance of the subject, then must it be rejected by all real lovers of truth. The word creed has an innocent as well as a noxious sense. If by professing to have a religious creed we admit the right of any fallible man or body of men to make a formula of faith which shall command the assent and be binding on the consciences of others, we give up at once the sacred privilege of religious liberty; but if we use the word creed as simply tantamount to belief, to say that we have no creed is only, in other words, asserting that we have no religion. We hear much of free inquiry, but where is it to be found? If free inquiry consists in looking at both sides of a question, collecting all the arguments we can find, and drawing our conclusions after carefully considering their respective force, I fear it is at the present day confined to a very few indeed. This is an age not of free inquiry, but of thick-coming fancies and a most distempered craving after novelty. Indistinct and fanciful conceptions, expressed in obscure and perplexed language, are the idols which the present generation is prone to worship. It requires little more in this age than a proud assumption of intellectual superiority and a copious flow of unintelligible phraseology, to entitle a man to the character of a profound philosopher or a deep theologian.

But I have already occupied much more of your space than I expected I should require, and I must defer to a future occasion the fuller development of the reasons why we should adhere to

the name Unitarian, an investigation of the causes why Unitarianism has hitherto made so little progress, some observations on its present state, and anticipations of what may be expected hereafter. The painful duty will then remain of endeavouring to controvert views of the resurrection countenanced by Mr. Tayler, which seem to me entirely subversive of the historical evidence of the truth of the Christian religion.

I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

GEORGE LONG.

MR. S. GREG ON THE PRESENT STATE OF UNITARIANISM.

MY DEAR SIR,

WILL you allow me space in your pages for a few more remarks upon a subject which your several correspondents in the last No. do not appear to me to have by any means exhausted, the real point and bearing of which, indeed, I think they have hardly touched upon? They have shewn where they thought Mr. Tayler wrong, but none of them have answered his question as to how Unitarianism can be set right. Indeed, two of them, if I have not misread the meaning of their words, seem to think it does not want setting right at all, and that it will do very well as it is. Perhaps I too, as well as they, may miss the answer we are seeking; but yet, if I may be allowed, I should like to say another word upon the subject, and I feel sure that those from whose views I may dissent will not withhold their welcome from any honest expression of opinion merely because it does not agree with theirs. It was in this belief that I ventured to write before. In the same belief I now write again.

I dwelt in my last letter chiefly on the more general aspect of the subject, and on those points which affect almost equally every sect and division of the Christian world. I wish now to confine myself to those more peculiar to the Unitarian body; and in doing this, I hope, Sir, your readers will allow me to speak freely and openly, even though they may think I do not always speak wisely. A man who writes under fear of giving offence to this party or to that, writes with his hands tied, and had better not write at all. If I am wrong, let me be corrected. If my views are too desponding, let others shew ground for more sanguine hopes. If I sometimes seem to forget those I am addressing in my earnest thought about the truth we are both seeking, I must entreat them, for the same reason, to forget, or to forgive, me.

The question before us, I believe, is the cause of the present unsatisfactory state of the Unitarian body, and the want of life and interest in our religious services and undertakings. Assuming the fact, which indeed is too palpable to be denied, may not the

following considerations point, in part at least, to some of the causes of this state of things among us?

In the first place, may we not find some cause for the evil we are lamenting in the relation that now frequently subsists between the ministers and their congregations among our Unitarian body? Is this relation all that it is desirable it should be? Do we not lose much on both sides, much both of knowledge and of influence, much of interest, warmth, and realization of religion, by the want of that relation which does subsist among some other bodies of our Christian brethren, between the minister and his people? In many of the Evangelical congregations of the Church of England, in many country parishes, among many of the Protestant churches of France and Germany, the minister is truly designated *the pastor*. He is the shepherd of his flock. He is not merely the priest in the temple, not merely the officiating minister at the celebration of religious worship,—but his relation to his people follows them to their homes, and remains with them in all the seasons and relations of life. He is their counsellor, their friend, almost their confessor. He has very close relations with almost every family; in some cases, with almost every individual of his congregation. Whatever we may think of the desirableness of this relation, it undoubtedly both increases the influence of the pastor among his people, and gives him an immense advantage in his public discourses to them; because, by the knowledge he has thus gained of their characters, of their sorrows, of their trials, of their mental, moral or worldly difficulties, he is able to speak to the heart of each with a power and reality which those who only send their shafts at random, and are obliged to trust to their knowledge, or supposed knowledge, of human nature in general, can never hope to gain. I know it will be said that such a relation between persons so situated is on many accounts objectionable, and would neither be possible nor desired among a body educated like our own. This may be; but in seeking for causes of the present state of apathy and coldness in the Unitarian body, I cannot pass over this one as being without weight. It appears to me to carry with it considerable importance, and to be well worth a few moments' consideration before it is altogether thrown aside as valueless. It may be impossible to establish such a relation among ourselves, but the cause of this impossibility may perhaps be found elsewhere than in the objectionable nature of the relation itself. That the influence it would give might be abused, and that it often is abused, there can be no question; but that in some modified form, and tempered and guided by warm piety, sound judgment and a genuine respect for the freedom of individual minds, it might be made an instrument for much good and useful action among any community of Christians, I think it would be difficult to deny. There are many who would rebel

against all priestly authority and interference as strongly as the most zealous Puritan, to whom yet a counsellor and communicant upon spiritual subjects would be most welcome. Now I think all of us could point to congregations among our body where the only relation that subsists between the minister and his people is only such as exists between a professor and his pupils, between a lecturer and his hearers. These last scarcely ever see their minister except in the pulpit,—have no other communication upon spiritual subjects but what passes when he holds forth to them on the Sunday,—and who, though he may visit their houses just as any other friend may do, acknowledge no special relation to him as a minister or spiritual counsellor. Now is this the kind of relation that ought to subsist between the minister and his congregation? Is it such a relation as admits the greatest good being done by the one party, and being received by the other? Do the precedents of early Christianity support it? Does the present state of society and education necessitate it? These are questions which ought to be asked, and which ought to be answered.

Again, as we are inquiring into the causes of an acknowledged fact, let us not pass by any nook or cranny in which such hidden causes may possibly be discovered. May there not, for instance, be something wanting in our public religious services, which, if supplied, might aid in bringing about the change we seek? Are these services all that we could desire to see them? Are they all that we possibly might make them? Do we enjoy and profit by them as we *ought* to enjoy and profit by such services? When we wend our way on the Sabbath morning towards the spot where we meet together to offer up our sacrifice of prayer and praise, do we experience anything, or as much as we might do, of the feeling of the Hebrew Psalmist, when he sang, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go up unto the house of the Lord"? While we sit there, or kneel there, joining in those services, do we feel our minds softened, elevated or humbled? Do we feel as if brought nearer to God—as if more able to accept and to believe in the realities of the spiritual world? Is the better part of our nature assisted in its upward flight towards a higher being; and does religion grow clearer to the eye of faith —warmer in love, brighter in beauty, stronger in power? And when we pass out from the doors of the sanctuary, do we retire with the feelings and the manner of those who for the last hour have felt that they were within it? If so, then it cannot be our services that make us dead, and it is not in altering these that we must seek for the vitality that we have lost.

Then may there be nothing in the style of our public preaching that is capable of inprovement? Is there nothing here which may have something to do with our present feeling upon these subjects—or rather, our present want of feeling? I do not refer

to *this* fault or to *that* fault—to *this* want or to *that* want—but to the whole tone and handling of the subject of religion in the greater number of our pulpits. This tone may be right, or it may be wrong. I do not presume to affirm either. But I ask, whether it meets the wants of those who listen to it; whether the fact of its *not* meeting those wants, is or is not one of the reasons why so many have left it, and are still leaving it? When we listen to many of our ministers, do we feel that they are going *to the root of the matter?* Do we feel that they are dealing with *the real thing?* Do we say or feel, "*This* now is like *religion* —this speaks to the heart—I understand *this*—I feel *this*—I recognize here the echo, faint though it may be, and low, and broken—yet still the true echo of Christ and of his spirit, which has been reverberating in the souls of men throughout all ages"? Do our ministers wake this echo in *our* souls? Do they seem to go down to the depths of them?—to know our trials, our sorrows, our perplexities, our aspirations, our fears, our hopes—the wrestlings with our lot—the cloud upon our sky—the cross that each of us is called to bear? Do they speak *to us*, or to the genus *man?* Do they speak ever of this latter as if they had known him by walking side by side with him along the road of life,—by mingling in the toil, and the pursuit, and the strife of the actual living world? Or as if they had studied human nature in general, as a spectator or a philosopher would study it—afar off, calmly, silently, alone,—through the cold medium of books —in the retirement of sedentary life—as a student, as a scholar, as a theologian? As they speak, do they enlighten, animate, elevate, spiritualize their hearers? Do they make duty plain, and virtue attractive, and the word of God clear, and the way of life beautiful, and everything connected with religion sacred, venerable and awful? Do they themselves seem to be thoroughly impressed—I might almost say oppressed—with the full and real nature of the subject they are handling—its immensity—its depth—its intimate bearing on our present happiness and future destiny? And when they cease to speak, do their hearers feel that they may really be wiser and better men for the words they have been listening to? If our ministers so speak upon the subject on which they have undertaken to be our instructors and spiritual assistants, it seems to me that our souls will not slumber under their ministrations, that we shall not afterwards complain of their dulness, and that we shall not leave them, as so many of the younger portion of our body are doing now, in search of some more genial climate and some more nourishing and welcome food.*

Now let no man take offence at these remarks, as reflecting

* Of course I do not speak of *all*. If *all* were like *some*, this paragraph would not have been written.

upon the body to which he happens to belong. This is no subject for personal feeling. We are all seeking a remedy for an evil whose presence and whose destroying nature we all acknowledge. Let us not shrink from the exposure of facts—if only they *be* facts—because the recognition of such things may be painful, or even, as some may think (*I* do not), humiliating. Let us establish the fact, if it be one, and then we may have some chance of mitigating or removing it. If any one denies the fact, by all means let him do so. If he can disprove it, all will gladly accept his disproval. But we wrong ourselves, and we wrong truth, if we shrink from expressing what appears to us to *be* truth, merely because the assertion of our view may be unpleasant to some who from their position and duties are bound up with the subject we are discussing. My convictions are very strong upon this point. I am sure that much harm is done to many a good cause from this, not by any means unamiable, fear of giving offence or pain. If we come into an arena of controversy where some really important subject is before us as the point at issue, we do not come to speak honeyed words, or pour soft flatteries upon our friendly antagonist, but simply to speak the truth; by which of course blind, imperfect man must mean—what *seems to him to be the truth.* This must be our aim; and we must trust to the manly love of truth on the part of our adversary to believe that *he* too is thinking of the same truth that we are, and will for a while forget himself in the one object for which both are striving.* Besides, I think that any man who is made of the right metal of a man, will be like Robin Hood in such a matter, and will be ready to cheer an honest blow, or a well-shot shaft, even though by chance it should knock a feather out of his own wing. With a very strong conviction, then, upon this point, I do not hesitate to ask the questions I have asked above. Those questions may perhaps point to the answers I myself should give, *for myself.* I put them in the form of questions that each may answer them for *himself.* And according to the answer given may we seek, or not, in the present style of our pulpit ministrations, some cause for the very unhappy state of religion, and the very uncomfortable feeling of mutual dissatisfaction, that now unfortunately prevails throughout our body.

Perhaps, indeed, our ministers may say, and justly, as some of their friends say for them, that they alone are not answerable in this matter, and that if it be their fate to address a cold, critical and impassive audience, it is quite impossible for them to be

* I have no fear that any one who knows either Mr. Tayler or his correspondent will suppose that *he* is in my eye as I write this. I have known him for forty years, and I have much misread him all that time, if, in such a controversy, he is not a man whose first thought will be about the truth before him, and whose last will be about himself.

warm, spiritual and effective in their appeals to such listeners. Very true. In such a case it must be impossible. The fault, if fault it be—rather let us say, the misfortune—or, at any rate, the fact—is probably on both sides. Doubtless the preacher and his audience must act and re-act upon each other. It may be that we only see the faults of our neighbours more clearly than our own. It is the old story—the mote and the beam still.

There is one point in Mr. Tayler's letter of December which I am sure he will in all kindness allow me to refer to. It is one which he only touches lightly here, but which, if my memory does not deceive me, he has in other recent writings dwelt on more urgently,—to such a degree indeed, I think, as, whether rightly or wrongly, to induce in other minds the impression that he regards this as one of the greatest desiderata in the present education of our ministers. This is a want of a deeper and sounder scholarship among our divines and theological writers. Now may not the urgency with which this has been dwelt upon, together with the prominent importance naturally given to it in our college course of instruction, tend to nourish in the mind of the young student a belief that this is the main purpose of his training, and incidentally to turn away his thoughts from qualifications yet more necessary to the successful discharge of his public ministrations? If so, do we not put that first which, if not last, is surely secondary in importance? I know I speak in ignorance when I speak thus, but I know also that I speak the thoughts of many others too upon this point; and though we may perhaps be altogether wrong about it, or may be wrong only so far as in supposing that Mr. Tayler, and others as well as he, assign to deep scholarship an importance which in reality they do not assign to it, it may yet not be undesirable that such an impression should be stated, if it were only that it might be contradicted, and that the right place and value which scholarship holds in the estimation of such men should be placed distinctly before the world. But in the mean time let me claim the privilege of ignorance, and speak freely my thoughts upon this matter. The learning of a scholar! What we want is *the spirit of an apostle.* What we want is the solemn earnestness of Peter—the devotional tenderness of John—the fire, life, energy and steadfastness of Paul. It was not scholarship that first spread abroad the light of Christianity among the nations. It was not scholarship that gave power to the preaching even of the most learned of the apostles. It was not scholarship that enabled Paul to open a highway through the hearts of men from Jerusalem to Ephesus; and so to speak to high and low, to Jew and Gentile, to bond and free, that their spirits burned within them, and they cared no longer for persecution and contempt and death, so that they might but win Christ and become heirs of the salvation he proclaimed. It was not by scholarship that Paul did

this; but by the deep, fervid fire of his own soul, with which he melted the stony hearts of his listeners, like iron that is softened in the furnace—with which he was able, like a true messenger of God, to "rend mountains, and break in pieces the rocks before the Lord." This surely is the spirit that we want among us now. This is the one thing needful. And if it be unreasonable to ask for an apostle, then give us back such men as Schwartz, or Oberlin, or Fenelon, or Channing. Let them bury their learning under a mountain, and let them bring us nothing but their fire and warmth and energy and life and love. Let them bring these, and let their voice be heard in every pulpit of our congregations, and we shall hardly miss the scholarship they have left behind them. The words of Christ would be echoing in our ears; the spirit of Christ would be breathing around us; our souls would rise towards the realities of the spiritual world; the greatness of our possible destiny—the weakness, darkness and danger of our actual being—would all rise visibly and realized to our view; feelings of deep veneration, of earnest hope, of practical humility, would spring up within us; and without being better able to argue about all the little difficulties and fragments of our religion, we should be lifted into a region of thought and experience where such dark problems could no longer trouble us.

Observe, however, that I would by no means undervalue the importance of sound scholarship and theological learning. It is doubtless extremely important in its right place. We can hardly, indeed, in these days do without it. But to believe that the deepest and the widest scholarship can meet our present wants, can call the dead to life, or waken those on whom has been poured the spirit of a deep sleep, or feed the famine of the hungry soul that is crying to heaven for the bread of life, is not only to mistake the remedy, but, as it appears to me, is to misunderstand altogether the nature and deep seat of the malady.

As I have already ventured, in my former communication, to say that there are some parts of Mr. Tayler's letters with which I do not agree, some which with much difficulty only I have been able to understand, and some which after all my efforts I have not been able to understand at all,—I also wish to say that there are other portions of those letters which I have read with a degree of pleasure amounting almost to gratitude. I have felt this because they seemed to express more clearly than I had ever been able to discover in his former writings what are his actual views upon some of the most interesting points of Christian doctrine, and because I rejoiced to find those views more in accordance than I had hoped with the same which I myself still cling to with the fondness of early recollection, and the associations and belief of many maturer years. I hailed this agreement because it gave the sanction of his scholarship, character and experience to opinions which in my own

case seem to have struck root rather in my heart than in my intellect; which I cannot always support with argument; which indeed it is not by any means agreeable to argue about; which I grasp with the tenacity of one who wishes now to enjoy his religion and not to fight for it, and who feels something perhaps of unreasonable resentment at any attempt to deprive him of that which he values more than he can always give a reason for, and in exchange for which he does not see that his antagonists offer him anything better. Without at all denying the difficulties that beset the subject of biblical interpretation,—without at all shutting my eyes to the fact that these difficulties must be met *now* by very different weapons to those forged in the last century,—without at all shrinking from inquiry and contemplative examination of the great problem of Christianity,—I yet *do* rather shrink from the manner in which these inquiries are frequently conducted. I *do* shrink from the conclusions to which they sometimes seem to lead. I *do* fear to see our religion fade away into the dim light of a beautiful philosophy, stripped of all the sanction of authority, reduced to the measure of its own merits, and that measure taken by the measure of each man's intellect or opinion. I *do* fear to see all that is peculiar and characteristic in Christianity wiped away—all that distinguishes it from the other religions of the world—all that gives it *vitality* and *meaning*. To me, Christianity is a revelation of God to man. To me, Christ is a wonderful and mysterious being, unlike any that ever appeared in the world before or since. *The Son of God!*—everything is in that word. I feel that if I could only sit at his living feet and ask him of these things, I could learn everything I desire to know, or I could cease to desire any knowledge that he would not impart. All I want to learn is what he said; *what he would say now*. Whatever that was, to me it would be eternal truth. I should ask no other authority than that he said it. That would be enough. It would be the voice of God to me; and I should only bow, believe and obey. Believing all this—feeling all this,—when I hear some men speaking of this sacred being—our Master, our Saviour, our Lord—speaking of him and things belonging to him as some ready theologians do,—I cannot but feel that they do not see him as I see him, or they surely could not speak thus. The waters and hills of Galilee fade away; the silent multitude by the sea-shore grows dim; the voice of music and power that was heard breathing through the still evening air dies in the distance; and the fetid atmosphere of an English court of justice seems to rise into the nostrils, while through the murkiness and gloom some harsh voice is heard interrogating a witness in the box, or denouncing some unfortunate prisoner at the bar. From scenes and sounds like these I turn joyfully away to seek the words and presence of one whose opinions on some minor points I am yet bold enough to question. I feel that with him

I am again breathing the pure air of Christianity; that the spirit of Christ is again around me; that I am walking with one who venerates everything that is venerable, who loves everything that is lovely, who is ready to bow to everything awful and godlike, and in whom, though I now and then think he has forgotten some of the steps by which he has risen to the height where he now stands, I yet seem to recognize the true mark of a disciple and a teacher of his Lord.

Some of my friends, to whom all this plain speaking sounds very much like suicide and treason, tell me that if I only knew as much of other sects, I should not express such strong dissatisfaction with our own. If I could see their narrowness, their bigotry, their bitterness, the contempt with which they look down on all who believe less than they, the rancorous hostility with which they assail all who believe more, I should be content to look lightly on the shortcomings of a body of Christians who at least let all men think as they like, and whose main principle and bond of union is the perfect freedom of every individual mind. To this I reply, that I have nothing to do with other sects; I do not belong to them; let them pull out the mote from their own eye. I am addressing myself to Unitarians, while I am yet one of them, and while yet my voice, like any other however humble, may rightfully be lifted up among them. I do not wish to measure ourselves by this sect or by *that*, but by Christ and Christianity. If we can stand the test of this measurement, all is right with us; if we cannot, there is something wrong. What that wrong is, we are now inquiring; and we shall in no way assist that inquiry, or turn wrong into right, only by shewing that some of our neighbours are still worse than we are. I am told that if I went into the churches of the Establishment, I should there find many of the very faults we complain of in our own—some of them aggravated and intensified—some only half covered with more decent drapery—some hallowed by the associations of years and the traditions of centuries—some of a more serious character than ours, more fatal to the influence of real religion on the heart, and to the maintenance and progress of truth throughout the world. I know it well. I am not altogether a stranger to the inside of our churches; and though I confess to sometimes feeling myself more at home among their services, and surrounded by the accessories that the taste and wealth of a National Church collect about them, than in some Unitarian chapels, I do not think I am by any means blind to their shortcomings, or to the points wherein they differ from my view of the pattern of a Christian church. But whatever may be the faults of the Establishment, we must remember that *we* are *not* the Establishment; and such a ship as she may carry in her capacious hold a cargo of faults, absurdities and superstitions, and yet breast the storm and ride bravely over the tossing waves, while one tithe of such a

freight aboard of us would sink our little craft to the bottom. We cannot afford to imitate the faults of the Establishment till we can enlist her multitudes and secure her benefices. We have nothing to trust to but the truth of our doctrines, and the warmth, beauty and vitality they impart. And the only question that remains for our consideration is this—whether, if the last should disappear amid the waves, the first could yet hold on its solitary course companionless and triumphant?

I think it would be extremely desirable, so that only it were possible, if every layman of our body would express publicly what he now grumbles out by the fire-side, as to the impression produced upon his own mind by the public services of our churches, by the ministrations of our pulpits, and by the general tone and handling of the whole subject of religion among us, whether in our places of worship or in our acknowledged publications. No matter whether those impressions were right or wrong, reasonable or unreasonable, distinct or but dimly recognized, their record would establish a substantial and important fact. It would be a piece of information, if it were nothing more; and by the light of that information we might direct some at least of our efforts towards the amendment of our condition, and towards that renovation of spiritual life which we are now seeking. I do not know in what degree we are all aware of each other's feelings upon this subject, but as far as my own little opportunities of intercourse allow me to inquire, I believe I may truly say that I scarcely ever meet a Unitarian layman and converse with him upon this theme, but I find him touching the same string, and that one whose tone is very far from satisfaction. Such a state of feeling indeed as now, if I am correct in my belief, prevails very extensively throughout our body, can point to only one conclusion. There are numbers who, if they are still riding at anchor among us, are doing so with a spring on their cable, and remain as members of the Unitarian body less from any real attachment to it or satisfaction in it, than because they look round in vain for any other church that, on the whole, can offer them a safer refuge. These men, on any such harbour opening to their view, will spread their sail, and away! to cast their anchor there. If we can read the signs of the sky, our prospects as a sect—even for a continuance of life—are, to say the least, not encouraging. The Established Church is hard by, ready to welcome and absorb any stray wanderer that seeks her shelter; and year by year, individuals and families are dropping from our ranks and disappearing under the shadow of her porch. Nor does it require any extraordinary gift of prophecy to foresee that, if things continue to go on among us as they go on now, the day will come ere long when we shall complain and inquire no more, and when nothing will be left of English Unitarianism but

the bare walls of our chapels and the silent pulpit standing in the midst of them.

Surely this should not be. There is a treasure of truth in Unitarianism that is worth saving. Is there not a spirit and life among Unitarians which may yet save it? If our little church be indeed, as some believe it, the ark of refuge in which is preserved the real truth of Christianity, surely it is worth a struggle to keep it from foundering amid the waves. If our altar be indeed that *one* before which we hope that all men will one day bow, it behoves us who now stand round it to see that the fire yet faintly burning there be not totally extinguished. But if Unitarianism is *to live*—still more, *if it is to spread*, it must put on some other aspect than that which it wears now. It must shew something more than the bare simple germ of truth that lies within it, and which ought to be its life and light. That truth must be clothed in beauty, grace and power. They who hold that truth must attract others towards it by the light, joy and humility it throws around its votaries: they must not challenge admiration and demand conviction. It is not thus that we shall spread abroad our doctrines, or make our temple that holy one which shall draw all men unto it. If ever Unitarianism is to become the creed of Christendom, there is only one way in which it can be made so, and that is by the Unitarian church becoming a model of what a Christian church should be,—a model not only in faith and doctrine, but in spirit, language and demeanour. We must no longer glorify ourselves as the wisest and the best; we must cease to thank Heaven that we are not as other men; and we must shew ourselves rather ready to be the servants and ministers of all. We must labour to make religion *a reality*,—to let it no longer be a cold, dead pageant or a formal creed. We must let its sacred fire burn in our hearts, there to soften, to elevate, to purify our inmost being. We must cease to assail the creeds of men, and lift our own souls in silent worship to the Father of our spirits. We must feel deeply the awful, wonderful, mysterious nature of those things on which our upward thoughts are dwelling. No light word, no rough handling, must shew that we have intruded ourselves into the sanctuary without knowing that it *is* the sanctuary. And, almost above all, or at least mingling with all, we must take heed that our religion be not one of time or of place, of the church or of the sabbath, but let it go with us where we go, and be with us where we dwell. On the Sunday and on the Monday, at the church and in the market, with our hand upon the altar, or our tongue pleading in the senate, or our worldly individuality driving a bargain with a fellow-man,—everywhere, in all presence and at all times, let us shew ourselves and feel ourselves the servants and disciples of our Lord. What he

would teach, let that be our creed; what he would have us feel, let that be our spirit; what he would have us do, let that be our law. When Unitarians become true Christians, then, and not till then, may we hope that Christians will become Unitarians.

Pardon me, Sir, if, in conclusion, I venture to extend the application of this principle beyond the narrow limits of the question we are now discussing, and remind your readers how that same rule of proselytism may on a wider field affect the whole destinies of the world. What I have said of one little sect among the multitude of other sects that now divide the sheep of the great Christian fold, I would also say of that country and of that faith to which we all belong. What I say of the truths of Unitarianism, I would also say of the liberty and the common Christianity of England. My strong conviction is, that if we are ever indeed to be, as some suppose, the chosen instruments in the hands of Providence to christianize and to emancipate the world, it will not be by sending forth missionaries to the remotest corners of the earth, and preaching the solemn mysteries of our faith to the savages of the East or of the West; neither will it be by sending forth armies to break the chains of enslaved nations, to hurl the tyrant from his throne, or to proclaim with the trumpet of war that the lowliest slave who weeps in the bondage of the West is still a man and a brother. But it will be by making our own little island a model of what a free and Christian nation should be—of what a free and Christian nation *might* and *shall* be. Let England herself, in all the relations of social, individual and political life, be only truly Christian, and by that one fact alone she will christianize the world. Let her do full credit to the liberty of a free people, and by that one fact alone she will emancipate the world. She will be a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid. She will shed abroad her light like the Temple of the New Jerusalem. Kings and peoples will draw near and do honour unto her. They will not only gaze and wonder and admire; but they will ask, "How comes it so? What is it that makes England so great, so secure, so beautiful, so stainless and so happy?" And when they find that all this is the fruit of her freedom, her virtue and her religion, will not *they* too seek to gain so glorious a prize by following the traces of her footsteps along the same path? This must be our road to conquest and to glory. *Thus* shall we convert the heathen, and civilize the savage, and strike the fetters from the limbs of the slave. Thus shall we plead the cause of oppressed nations, and make nationalities be respected, and the rights of all men be held sacred. Thus shall we plant the sacred Cross of our religion on every shore, from the burning wastes of Africa to the green islands far away that gem the broad bosom of the Pacific. From the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, men shall grasp each other's hands as children of the same Father, as bro-

thers of the same human family. They shall each bid God-speed to his neighbour as they move forward together on their way, as travellers along the same road, as pilgrims towards the same shrine, as seekers of the same salvation. And if ever such a day may come, then indeed will be fulfilled that prayer which has been breathed by successive generations of Christian men for eighteen hundred years, and "His kingdom shall come, and His will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Yours very truly,

S. Greg.

MR. SHARPE ON SOME MISTRANSLATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Sir,

Though very little of a Hebrew scholar, I venture to lay before your readers a few mistakes which seem to require correction in the translation of the Old Testament. My apology for doing so is, that the reasons by which I am guided are antiquarian rather than grammatical, and I wish the corrections which I offer to be judged of by those who have more knowledge of the language.

Numbers xxxiii. 7: "And they removed from Etham, and turned again unto Pi-hahiroth, which is before Baalzephon; and they pitched before Migdol. 8. And they departed from before Pi-hahiroth, and passed through the midst of the sea into the wilderness." Correct thus: *And they removed from Etham, and turned unto the Bay of Hahiroth, which is before Baalzephon; and they encamped before Migdol* [*or the Tower*]. 8. *And they departed from before Hahiroth, and passed through the midst of the sea into the desert.* Remark that in verse 7 is mention of the Bay of Hahiroth, and in verse 8, of the city of Hahiroth or Heroopolis. Migdol, the tower, is probably the Castle of Ajeroud, or at least a tower which may have then stood in the same spot. From Isaiah xi. 15, we may learn that the Bay of Heroopolis at that time reached as far northward as the city of the same name; and that the head of the Bay was called the Tongue of the Egyptian Sea, which, now that it is cut off, forms the Bitter Lake.

Numbers xxiv. 21: "And he looked on the Kenites, and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock." For "a rock," we should write, *the city of Sela*, called by the Greeks, Petra. The conquest of this city by the Jews is mentioned in 2 Kings xiv. 7, and its yearly tribute of a lamb to Jerusalem is mentioned in Isaiah xvi. 1.

Isaiah xlii. 11: "Let the inhabitants of the rock sing; let

them shout from the top of the mountains." Correct as before: *Let the inhabitants of Sela* (or Petra) *sing.*

Ezekiel xxix. 3: "Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers." Though the translation of the names of animals is very uncertain, we may here safely write, *the great crocodile*, a very natural animal to make use of for a figure of speech when speaking of Egypt. In verse 4, we are told that it was an animal with scales.

Ezekiel xxix. 10: "Behold, therefore I am against thee, and against thy rivers; and I will make the land of Egypt utterly waste and desolate, from the Tower of Syene even unto the border of Ethiopia." The word *Migdol*, or *Tower*, should be left untranslated. It is the name of a well-known city, called by the Greeks, Magdolus. We should write, *From Magdolus to Syene on the border of Ethiopia*, and allow the prophet to describe correctly the whole length of the country, without making him appear ignorant of geography.

Ezekiel xxx. 6: "From the tower of Syene." Correct as before: *From Magdolus to Syene.*

Nahum iii. 8: "Art thou better than populous No, that was situate among the rivers?" Correct thus: *Art thou better than No-Amun?*" Thebes, the Egyptian capital, is here spoken of. It was called by the Egyptians themselves, Amunei, *the residence of Amun*, or in Greek, Diospolis; and sometimes Naa-Amunei, from Naa, *great*, translated Diospolis Magna, to distinguish it from Diospolis Parva, a city in the Delta. In Ezekiel xxx. 14 and 15, this city is called simply No.

In your pages, these hints will certainly fall under the eyes of the scholars who are busy upon the new translation set on foot by the Unitarian Association; and, if thought good, may by them be used. S. S.

OBSTINATE RESISTANCE TO INNOVATION AND RECKLESS FONDNESS FOR CHANGE.

The two kinds of absurdity here alluded to may be compared respectively to the acts of two kinds of irrational animals, a moth and a horse. The moth rushes into a flame, and is burned; and the horse obstinately stands still in a stable that is on fire, and is burned likewise. One may often meet with persons of opposite dispositions, though equally unwise, who are accordingly prone respectively to these opposite errors: the one partaking more of the character of the moth, and the other of the horse. Archbishop Whately.

A MINISTER'S RETROSPECT.

Chapter III.

COLLEGE DAYS AND COMPANIONS.

What a solemn responsibility does a youth of seventeen feel himself to have undertaken, in leaving his family and friends for the first time, to reside some hundreds of miles away from them, and become practically his own master! O what earnest resolutions did I form, when my father gave me his blessing and most affectionately said he believed he could trust me to conduct myself virtuously, and my mother added that it would break her heart to think otherwise for a moment of her eldest boy, when he should become a man!

My father, a few days before my departure, called me into his consulting-room and spoke to me as only a father can, and as every pure-minded and religious father, I think, ought to speak, distinctly to his son when just rising into manhood, and especially if about to leave his sight. He spoke to me of the new and various temptations (unknown to me thus far except by vaguest report) which the wider world would present. He astonished and shocked my unsuspecting and unsullied heart by telling me what places of temptation to low, sensual and wicked pleasure—to intemperance, gambling and licentiousness—are open, in all large towns especially, for the plunder, arising out of the moral degradation, of young men who know no better than to follow the impulses of appetite and passion. He told me of one or two young men slightly known to me, of promising talents and seemingly pure minds, who going from virtuous homes had presently fallen into the depth of dissolute profligacy. He warned me against indulgence and excess in eating and drinking; and, as regards the latter, recommended me, on principles alike of health and morals, to use water as my habitual beverage, and to maintain strict moderation and sobriety on all occasions of friendly hospitality. ("Teetotalism" was then an uncoined barbarism of the English language, but Temperance had its full meaning.) A young man in good health, he said, does not need any stimulant besides that of a wholesome and generous meat diet; and he will do well to reserve others till later in life, when he may have more occasion for them; nor will he ever regret having been independent of them while in his vigour. "Some young men," he added, "of studious habits and but moderate finances, sometimes fall under an opposite temptation, in becoming careless of the claims of the bodily system. Their intemperance is that of study; and, like every other excess, it is sure to tell its tale against them, sooner or later. If they carry their excess so far as also to encroach upon the time properly due to sleep, this is another sin against the great laws of health. Regu-

larity of work and meals and rest is one of the prime conditions not only of health, but of morals and of effective progress in study."

He then plainly but with truest delicacy alluded to the awful temptations which address themselves to the young. He said what an occasion of thankfulness it had ever been to him to remember, and what a source of comfort he had ever since found it, that his youth had been innocent; and he appealed to me in the name of the sacred calling to which I proposed to devote myself, in addition to all the motives of universal morality and regard for my family, that it ought to be morally impossible for me to fall from purity and rectitude. Would that every youth, at that critical age, could hear a wise and pure-hearted father like mine saying to him what mine said to me! His words are still vocal to my ears; and I impressed them successively, in his revered name, upon my two youngest brothers, to whom his death left me in the place of guardian, and upon my own son when first rising into manhood.

"You are now ceasing to be a boy," he said; "you are becoming a young man. This transition period is one of the most critical periods of your life. You are leaving for a time the parental roof to mingle in new and unwonted scenes. You may have the misfortune to meet with associates who, themselves impure in thought and conduct, will ridicule and undermine the purity of others. In many ways temptation may assail you; but as you value your self-respect both now and hereafter, resist it as though you were struggling for life itself. As the son of your mother, I charge you to hold the female character in honour, and this you can only do by associating with none but the pure and good of the better sex. It is my earnest hope that you may hereafter find one worthy of a pure, devoted and reciprocal affection, and that in marriage you may experience the unalloyed happiness which is the portion of the pure in heart. I charge you then to practise the most scrupulous delicacy of thought and conduct towards every woman, and especially every young woman, of your acquaintance. Worldly people are indeed accustomed, as you will know too soon, to wink at a laxity of conduct in young men, such as the very same persons would regard with perfect horror as the barest possibility on the part of a daughter; forgetting apparently that the sin of the one sex implies the sin of both, and precisely the same sin in both. Remember that the purity which so rigidly guards the daughters of our families from the touch of shame is, in the just eye of Heaven, equally incumbent upon our sons. The apostle Paul calls both by the same holy term; and no words can be more emphatic than those which he uses in dissuading from its violation, as the most degrading vice of the heathenism which he saw around him. Purity is just as incumbent, in the estimate of eternal morals, upon a young

man as upon a young woman, though that of the latter may be guarded by the more awful temporal sanctions; and the judgment of society is therefore most wicked, which, while it consigns an erring woman to irretrievable shame and ruin, seems to think no worse of a man who is known to be licentious. Its cruel unforgivingness on the one hand is shewn to be hypocritical by its unprincipled laxity on the other. You have not learnt thus to sophisticate with good sense or good principle; and I trust you never will. God bless you and help you, my son! He will help you, whenever you seek His strength under the consciousness of your own weakness or in the love of His commands. Never lose the habit of private prayer, and you will keep the sense of habitual duty and devotion."

Such, and almost in those very words, were my dear father's parting counsels. To which he added, that his professional knowledge and experience could fearfully confirm these moral and religious injunctions, by the disastrous consequences of their violation which he was continually witnessing,—consequences ruinous alike to the bodily constitution, to intellectual power, and to all high aims and desires.

Alas! I soon became aware of the prevalence of dissolute habits among the young men around me. Too often, then and ever since, have I found the corrupt judgment prevailing and avowed, against which I was thus warned. To my inexpressible disgust, I have heard a sophistical distinction made between the wrong-doing of the two sexes by persons who would have resented the imputation of loose morals. It is said that in the higher walks of life, even women—virtuous, pure-minded and delicate in everything but this—will palliate the irregularities of young men, and act upon, if they do not approve, the detestable saying in favour of "a reformed rake." If there are such women, I cannot but feel that they are not an honour to their sex, and that they help to sanction the evil, which they might, by a truer and sterner judgment, control if not eradicate. If every young man who now ceases to be pure knew that he would thereby be shut out from good society half as rigidly as the wretched partner of his vice,—that if the irregularity of his habits were known, he would be instantly rejected by every virtuous woman whose hand he sought in marriage,—such young men would find a tremendous motive to self-restraint just where they now find excuse and apology ready for them.

Would that this record of a father's counsels might reach the hearts of some who are now young! For I fear that a mistaken feeling of delicacy prevents many an excellent father from giving his son express counsel on this all-important subject, just at the time when it is most needed, when the temptation to wrong-doing is strongest, and there is in the youthful mind entire ignorance of the terrible penalties of sin. And while this reserve is

maintained between the young man and his father, the probability is that among his companions there will be some dissolute ones from whose lips he may hear allusions and suggestions which he is unprepared by mere ignorance and innocence to withstand, and may be led along with the rest, like the "young man void of understanding" in the Proverbs, "as an ox goeth to the slaughter, or as a fool to the correction of the stocks, till a dart strike through his liver; as a bird hasteth to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life."

Armed with such counsels from my wise and excellent father, and with all corresponding good resolutions in my own breast, I wended my way northward for the Scottish University. For the sake of economy, and the combined advantage and enjoyment of passing through much beautiful scenery, I walked to Bristol, and crossing thence to Chepstow, walked buoyantly through the charming scenery of Monmouthshire and amid the rich orchards and hop-gardens of Herefordshire (the former then dropping their ripe apples into the cider-mills); detouring a little into North Wales on my way to Chester and Liverpool, at which latter place I was consigned to a friend of my father's, who helped me to a ship for Glasgow. That quiet, solitary tour was of great value to me. It gave me the best opportunities of reflection, self-inquiry and good resolution, while filling my soul to the full with such perceptions of the beauty and grandeur of Nature as had never before visited me. I had always been a devout admirer of Nature in the more familiar beauty of our own pretty neighbourhood; but the variety of her scenes and the grandeur of many that now spread themselves in succession before me, were my new experiences in this important and distant journey. I felt myself to have grown in mental and moral stature and strength during the three weeks that intervened between my leaving my father's house and taking up my quarters in lodgings near the High Street, Glasgow.

Here I devoted three happy sessions to the undivided pursuit of general knowledge. I was especially indebted to Professor Young for the cultivation of my prevailing classical and literary tastes; and to Mylne for first leading me into the rich fields of Mental and Moral Philosophy, the latter of which especially I felt to bear the same relation to the Christian precepts, as Natural and Mental Science to the Christian theology; and then and ever since I have found it to be the very heart and soul of my practical ministrations in the pulpit and out of it. To Jardine I was scarcely less indebted for that culture of the power and habit of thought and expression which was the real function of his professorship of Logic. I duly graduated B.A. and M.A., as matter of course. I must have been a dolt or an idler indeed to have failed. And then, my father, taking counsel with uncle Peter as to the best means of securing that direct theological

culture for which the Presbyterian ministry had always been noted, determined to send me for two years to the Manchester College at York, where, a year or two before, by a most wise decision of its Trustees, it had been placed under the care of the now venerable Rev. Charles Wellbeloved. My ever-honoured Teacher! I trust his arm-chair is as easy as mine, and his longer evening as calm and bright!

These two years were a period of perfect happiness and enthusiasm to me. I seemed to be realizing the pursuits to which all hitherto had been merely instrumental and preparatory. I was now a Theological student; whereas hitherto I had been studying everything except theology,—yet all with a view to my being fitted for entering upon that higher department. Hebrew was a new language to be still acquired for this purpose; and at this I worked hard and with competent success. O, those were blessed days indeed! I could not imagine greater happiness on earth than was mine. My little lodging fairly stored with books of my own, and access given to the boundless treasures of the College Library, seemed all that I could desire. I had the seclusion of the monk, without his penances; his freedom from worldly care and devotion to study, without his forced renunciation of life's endearments. I could have taken the student's vow, had such a vow been offered me. For a fellowship in York College, had there been such a thing, I could have worked night and day. Not that I ever did overwork myself; I did not believe in overwork, as being really effective. Regular habits of rising and retiring to rest, of study, of meals and of walking (an hour a day at least, with conscientious fidelity), were the means of constant health and good spirits and fair attainment. I was never a robust man, but few have suffered less actual illness than I have. The only grief of those days was the prospect of their being so soon ended. When I felt most sensible of the advantages put within my reach, I also felt how boundless was the sphere of study opened to me. And when my two years came to an end, what would I not have given for permission to spend another such year in similar pursuits under the same able and kind guidance! I did not feel as if I had completed my studies and were fit to be a teacher of religion myself. Perhaps I should have felt the same after another year's study.

Since those days, the Manchester College has passed through many new phases of successively increasing completeness in its arrangements for the higher education both of candidates for the Christian ministry and of young men seeking a liberal secular education apart from the degrading insincerity of subscription to articles of belief. And though its courses of general literature, science and philosophy have been, in a great degree, superseded by those of the University College, London, since its removal to the metropolis, I doubt whether the latter equal in

efficiency the instruction which was given in the York College, in the zenith of its strength, to my son and his contemporaries; while the simple manliness of its theological course, as I myself attended it so many years ago, is not yet surpassed by the able men who now preside over it in Gordon Square, nor approached any where else in this country.*

Retracing those days of delighted study at Glasgow and at York, I recal some dear and enthusiastic friendships of my youth. How few of their objects now survive! With Rivington I ran hand-in-hand in classical and literary studies. He had more imagination than I; perhaps I had (at least he said so) the better critical faculty. We helped each other in learned lore and mental culture. We read the English poets and orators together; and if he desired to emulate the former, it was my ambition (how little realized in my quiet pulpit duties) to rank among the latter. His mind was serious while cheerful; and I thought at one time that he would have accompanied me to York and into the ministry; but he chose the Law, and, alas! had hardly time to prove his ability or his high character; for he died young. Derwent was another of my intimate friends. He had a sound metaphysical mind, and a great turn for natural philosophy; and I looked up to him in the Logic and Moral Philosophy classes. Excellent friends as we were, and fellow-lodgers one session, we never met again since leaving Glasgow. So widely do the imperative calls of life divide sworn friends! There were no railways then; and distance (with shilling postages) made even correspondence rare between us, till, soon after a sad but blameless marriage, he altogether ceased to write to me. I believe he still lives, a good man, but long since bowed down with strange cares, esteemed and respected too highly for pity upon his strange and forsaken lot. He is (or was) a medical man, of good skill and great humanity, and found happiness in doing good. Many others, good friends and intelligent companions, but less intimate, how entirely did I soon lose sight of, and they of me! At York fewer met than at Glasgow, but it was to part to less remote distances on the whole. Some of my companions in the theological classes have held high positions in our churches. With one of my lay friends it was my happiness to be, during my first congregational settlement, within reach of occasional, and always most cordial, visits. My fellow theologian N—— was the sharer of all my theological difficul-

* Since this was written, I learn with feelings of surprise and sorrow, to which I dare not give free utterance, that the Theological Professorship is about to cease to occupy its hitherto prominent and distinct character, and that its functions are to be distributed among three different teachers. I wish the arrangement may be more satisfactory than I can hope or imagine. But I greatly fear the result will be, that in a few years our ministers will be less distinguished for sound Biblical learning than they have hitherto been.

ties and interest after we were both settled as ministers. His work on earth is lately closed, and its end seemed to say to me that my own active duties might well be considered as completed, and the little time that may still remain for me be spent in the quiet of my own dear home. Through what various, and in some cases what strange and sad, turns of life some others whom I recal have passed!—through adventures at home and abroad, through difficulties and dangers of their own making, or made for them! How some have sunk heavily, some risen buoyantly on the surge! How some have seemed to prosper in all they took in hand! How others seemed always unfortunate! O, what joys and sorrows! What stores of character does life accumulate, and death hoard up for immortality!

Erratum—P. 107, for *Brabland* read *Bretland.*

BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR OF THE REV. THOMAS DIX HINCKS, LL.D., M.R.I.A.

He was the son of Mr. Edward Hincks, who at the time of his marriage lived in Chester, but some months before the birth of their son had removed to Dublin, residing on Bachelor's Quay, where Thomas Dix, his eldest son, was born, June 24, 1767. He was baptized by Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Moody, minister of Strand-Street congregation. His second name (Dix) was taken from his mother's family. He had a brother and two sisters, all of whom were left to a widowed mother when she was only twenty-six years old. He was in his fifth year when his father died. He was fully sensible of what they all owed to their mother, who was allowed to retain her husband's situation in the Custom-house for many years, the duties of which she discharged with such accuracy and diligence as to procure the esteem of all. It may be added, that throughout a long life—for she lived to a very advanced age—she was held in the highest estimation (and deservedly so) by every one that knew her.

Mr. Hincks received the early part of his education under Mr. Hodgson, minister of Nantwich, in Cheshire; was afterwards a pupil of Dr. Adamson, of Park Street, Dublin; and, having been interrupted in his regular course with him by a rheumatic fever, finding that he could not resume his studies with the same class, he was sent as a boarder for a year to Dr. Mercer, of Crumlin, near Dublin. His first destination was for the medical profession, and as the best preparation for this he was apprenticed for three years to Mr. A. Thwaites, a respectable apothecary. He took a strong dislike to the scenes of pain that he witnessed there, and his indentures were given

up to him at the end of two years, when he resumed his studies to prepare for entering Trinity College, Dublin. His tutor there was Dr. Digby Marsh, of whom he spoke with affection and regard.

In 1786, he became a member of the Historical Society, which could boast of bringing forward as many men of high reputation for eloquence in after life as any other society of the kind. In his time the chief speakers were Mr. Bushe, afterwards Chief Justice, and Mr. Greene, afterwards Recorder of Dublin. He had been nearly four years in college, and was now twenty-one years old, when, observing that Hackney New College was to open in September, and that he should lose his session there in preparing for the ministry if he remained to answer for his degree, he removed his name from the College books, which he afterwards regretted. To accomplish his journey to Hackney in those days, he was obliged to purchase a horse and ride the whole way, and at the end of his journey he sold the horse. Entering Hackney as an advanced pupil, when Drs. Price, Kippis and A. Rees were the principal tutors, he was allowed at the end of his session to preach, and undertook to supply the pulpit of the absent minister of Maidstone for six weeks, spending the remainder of the summer among his friends in Norwich, Diss and other places, and during the succeeding winter preaching for most of the London ministers in the same connection.

It was at this time that the Rev. Samuel Perrott, of Cork, wrote to Dr. Kippis for an assistant, and he recommended Mr. Hincks to go. After preaching for six weeks, he was unanimously chosen. There was afterwards some difficulty in his settlement, created by a misunderstanding with some of the ministers of the Southern Presbytery respecting his ordination, in which he firmly and to his pecuniary loss maintained his own views. There seems to have been some misapprehension on both sides, principally arising from the usages of the Northern Presbyterians not being adopted by the English brethren. But all was amicably settled. He was ordained in 1792 by Dr. Moody, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Perrott and others, and co-operated heartily with the other ministers of the body in all measures for the advancement of religious truth.

The limitation of his means pending his dispute with the Southern Presbytery caused him to open a school (1791), commencing with three pupils, but soon increasing to the full number that he had proposed. He was now the founder of what has since become a flourishing and useful Library, to which he acted as Secretary, and by so doing mainly promoted its success. In September, 1791, he was married to Miss Ann Boult, a mutual attachment having been formed before he left Trinity College, and with her he lived for forty-four years, her death occurring in March, 1835. She was an excellent botanist, and formed an

Herbarium, which she presented to the Royal Cork Institution on leaving that city for Fermoy.

It was a happy characteristic of the period of his settlement in Cork that there was so little of that alienation that now prevails among Christian sects. He was thus enabled to originate or promote many useful plans. He had many valuable friends among the Episcopalians and Roman Catholics; but he spoke of none with more admiration than Dr. Longfield, who, notwithstanding their difference in religious and political principles, was always ready to promote his literary views, and who was competent, from his very superior acquirements in almost all departments, to give most valuable advice. In the same liberal spirit he became a member of the Benevolent Society, and in the discharge of his arduous duties as such he co-operated with both Methodists and Roman Catholics in relieving distress and want. In 1795, he wrote his Letters to the Inhabitants of Cork, in answer to the calumnies against the Christian religion in Paine's Age of Reason. This publication was so much esteemed that a second edition was published by the Society for Discountenancing Vice, which consisted of persons that widely differed from him in religious opinions. In 1796, he commenced a Magazine, which dropped for want of spirit in the booksellers to encourage the plan. On the death of his colleague, Mr. Perrott, becoming sole minister, and thus receiving an addition to his income, he reduced his school. In the famine year of 1800, he laboured so earnestly in conjunction with the London Society for Bettering the Poor, that his health gave way, and he was obliged to go to England for relaxation. On his return, he received a gratifying address and piece of plate from the inhabitants. He printed an account of the Charitable Institutions of Cork, in a Letter addressed to Lord Hardwicke; resumed his school on higher terms; and commenced those lectures to young ladies, and another course to his male pupils, that led to the formation of the Royal Cork Institution. The prosecution of this plan required great exertions both of body and mind—in going to London to purchase apparatus—in preparing a syllabus and delivering courses of lectures—printing an abridgment of Tytler's Elements of History; and being encouraged to apply for Government aid through Mr. Foster, he was much and laboriously occupied in creating an interest among persons of influence; in the course of which he went with the then Bishop of Cork, the present Primate, to call on the Lord Lieutenant. The result was the formation of a charter and the recommendation of a grant. In this plan Sir John Newport took an early and judicious interest; and thus the plan was commenced under one administration and completed under another of opposite politics. In 1803, he was admitted a Member of the Royal Irish Academy. He was now offered a salary of £150, if he

gave up his school, which he agreed to, and with great energy promoted the objects of the Institution, for which new premises were taken, and to them he and his family removed in 1810. He edited the Munster Agricultural Magazine, quarterly, as long as he remained in Cork, and continued lecturing on Chemistry and Natural Philosophy till 1813, when Mr. Edmund Davy was appointed to the former and Dr. Willis to the other. At this time he was also a contributor to Rees's Cyclopædia, for which he wrote the articles respecting Ireland, both historical and geographical, and others. He was also a contributor to various scientific, literary and religious periodicals. In 1814, though meditating a change to Fermoy to succeed Dr. Adair, he gave much time to the interests of the Institution, spending great part of the autumn in England on various duties connected with it.

In 1815, he settled at Fermoy, and discharged the ministerial duties of a small congregation which he formed, and which assembled in the Court-house. But after six years' trial, being disappointed in the result, he became a candidate for the Head Mastership in the Belfast Academical Institution, vacant by the death of Dr. William Neilson. For this situation he was recommended by testimonials from the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, the Bishop of Limerick, from Judge Jackson and Serjeant Warren, who had been his pupils in Cork, and from many others. He was elected, and removed to Belfast in 1821, in which the last thirty-six years of his life were spent. In 1822, he was appointed Professor of Hebrew, and, on a sudden vacancy in the Chair of Natural Philosophy in the collegiate department, delivered lectures on Experimental Philosophy in conjunction with Dr. Thomson, who took the Mathematical portion of the subject. In 1834, he received the degree of LL.D. from the University of Glasgow. In 1836, he retired from the Head Mastership, retaining the Professorship of Hebrew. During his continuance in that office, he had published several school-books, in particular a Greek and English Lexicon, which was a great improvement on those in use, and which has been reprinted, and is still much esteemed. In 1832, he undertook a much more laborious work, for which he collected many books and read many authors: it was a large Lexicon on an enlightened and comprehensive plan; but after printing a specimen of the work and making considerable progress, he abandoned the scheme. On the establishment of the Queen's College in Belfast, the old Collegiate Institution was of course dissolved; but he and the other Professors, who were thus deprived of their Chairs without any fault or deficiency on their part, were liberally treated by the Government; and Dr. Hincks spent the remainder of his life in literary leisure, during which his ever active mind was always occupied, and the subjects of

his studies were various; but more of his time was devoted to Scripture and its collateral studies than to any other. In the affairs and politics of Canada he was naturally led to take a deeper interest from the circumstance of his youngest son, the Hon. Francis Hincks, holding a high situation in Lord Elgin's Ministry. And he had the satisfaction of seeing his merit acknowledged by his appointment to the Governorship of Barbadoes.

In his family connection he felt particularly happy; for though two of his sons had become ministers in the Established Church, and other two, with a grandson, had become Unitarian ministers, yet there never was the slightest diminution of parental, filial or brotherly affection. In his own religious opinions he was consistent throughout. He joined in communion with the congregation of Strand Street, Dublin, when Dr. Moody was minister and his friend Dr. Bruce was his colleague. He studied for his profession under Drs. Price, Kippis and Abraham Rees. He preached his own views in Cork distinctly, but without controversy; and on his removal to Belfast he joined the congregation of which his friend Dr. Bruce was pastor, and remained a member of the same to the last.

Not only did he refrain from theological controversy, but he felt particularly happy that the course of his life had led him to a just appreciation of true religiousness of character in every denomination. Of his mother's family, one belonged to the Established Church, one to the orthodox Dissenters, and one worshiped in Strand Street along with his mother; and his relatives in England belonged principally to the orthodox Dissenters. In Dublin College he learned to value Dr. Digby Marsh, Dr. Magee, Dr. Elrington and others. His tutors in Hackney have been already mentioned, and he was there acquainted with Theophilus Lindsey, R. Robinson, of Cambridge, Belsham and others. In Cork he was treated with much respect by the Bishop and the clergy of different churches. In Belfast he was not in any ministerial office, and was therefore not called on to take part in those scenes of bigotry and intolerance that reflect disgrace on the Northern Presbyterians. Until these disputes had become so rife, there was the same, or perhaps even greater, interchange of esteem and good offices, and the same mutual co-operation, among the clergy of different persuasions in Belfast, that seem to have existed in Cork in his time. It may be added that he was Corresponding Secretary of the Royal Belfast Botanical Society, a Member of the Literary Society, and President of the Natural History and Philosophical Society, and afterwards Honorary Vice-President of the same.

Instead of the intended summary of the benefits conferred by him on Literature, Science and Religion, I find that I cannot effect my purpose better than by quoting a document presented

to him, not very long before his last illness—about the middle of January—from the inhabitants of the early scene of his labours,—thus answering a double purpose, of stating the triumphant gratification with which he received the document, and conveying in its words a very true and eloquent statement of his exertions and their effects.

"Venerable Sir,—The Managers of the Royal Cork Institution, in entering upon this the 50th year of their incorporated existence, gladly avail themselves of the auspicious occasion to express to you the esteem and respect with which they regard the venerable Founder of the Institution.

"It is to them, as it must be to the large circle of friends who know and appreciate your worth, a source of deep gratification that it has pleased the Almighty Disposer of events to vouchsafe to you a length of years which has enabled you to witness the realization of the labours of your early life for promoting popular instruction in the sciences and useful arts. To you, Ireland is indebted for having excited attention to the want of Literary and Scientific Institutions easily accessible to all classes, where means could be afforded of diffusing the knowledge and facilitating the general introduction of all improvements on arts and manufactures, especially agriculture, and for teaching, by courses of philosophical lectures and experiments, the application of science to general pursuits. The local public of this city and of the South of Ireland, roused by your appeal, and stimulated by the publication of your varied school works, which opened the treasures of knowledge to the youthful mind, founded this Institution. Belfast followed the example; and an impulse was thus given throughout the country for the encouragement of Scientific and Literary Associations.

"But it was not alone in the encouragement of popular lectures and the improvement of elementary teaching that the influence of your exertions may be recognized. As the Institutions which owed their origin to you grew into importance, they became the active elements of the great Educational movement which has obtained for the people of Ireland a system of National Education, and the establishment of Academical Institutions, which have already acquired a distinguished position amongst the long-established Universities of the kingdom.

"When conveying to you, venerable Sir, this expression of their sentiments, the Managers of the Royal Cork Institution cordially sympathize with the pride you must naturally feel in the success and fame of your sons, who, educated beneath your paternal care, are at present filling high official stations in the political and scientific departments of the State.

"Fervently hoping that Providence may spare you many years in tranquil contemplation of the good and useful services you have done your country, we subscribe ourselves, on the part of the Managers of the Royal Cork Institution,

Your faithful and obedient Servants,

Thomas Tobin, Knt., Chairman, &c. &c."

(with 15 signatures).

How few instances could we find of one, after forty-two years' absence from a place, being so remembered and so addressed!

Dr. Hincks's intellectual character was marked by the large

extent and variety of his acquirements in the sciences, languages and history; his moral and religious character, by a firm, fervent, rational piety; by freedom from all sectarian spirit, combined with steady opinions on religious doctrines; by his anxiety for the welfare of his friends; and by the conscientiousness, earnestness and energy with which he fulfilled any obligation or discharged any duty.

The traits already mentioned (and many similar, but relating more to private life, might be added) sufficiently mark his character as fully deserving that reverential respect with which he was universally honoured, and that affectionate regard with which he was viewed by his personal intimates and friends.

Having witnessed all the great revolutions in society from the American war to the present time, he died on Feb. 24, in the 90th year of his age,—surrounded by tenderly affectionate sons and daughters,—in full possession of his faculties,—thankful for all God's goodness towards him,—trusting in His mercy through Jesus Christ, and cheerfully submissive to his Father's will. He was buried in the churchyard of Killileagh, his eldest son's parish, where his wife had been buried twenty-two years before.

W. B.

THE KINGDOM AND PEOPLE OF SIAM—SIR JOHN BOWRING.*

These interesting volumes come out opportunely. At a time when the name of their author is the mark for denunciation from Lord Derby down to the smallest of hustings' orators, it is well that the English people should be put in possession of documents which prove that the representative of Her Majesty in China is neither a vain fanatic nor a bloodthirsty man, but that, on the contrary, he is skilful in diplomacy, and, while becomingly eager for the promotion of the material interests of his country, not forgetful of what is due to the higher interests of civilization and humanity. Both as a negociator, entrusted by the Sovereign of England with very large powers, which he has used with remarkable skill and success in making a treaty promising important results to our new ally and to our own commerce, and as an author describing a very remarkable kingdom, of which our knowledge hitherto has been small, Sir John Bowring is entitled to the respect and gratitude of his countrymen.

Siam, situated in the peninsula beyond the Ganges and in that of Malay, is, though a tributary of the Chinese Empire, an important Eastern kingdom, of about 1200 miles in length, with a

---

* The Kingdom and People of Siam; with a Narrative of the Mission to that Country in 1855. By Sir John Bowring, F.R.S., Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary in China. 2 vols. 8vo. London—Parker and Son.

breadth of about 350 miles. The earliest European relations with Siam were formed by the Portuguese as far back as 1511. Holland, France and Spain have in the intervening period made various attempts, with little enduring success, to establish commercial and other relations with Siam. In 1822, the Governor-General of India sent Mr. Crawford on an embassy to Siam and Cochin China, but his mission to these courts was not followed by important results. Four years afterwards, a treaty was formed by Captain Burney with the King of Siam, but it was rather of a political than a commercial character, and had relation chiefly to the exigencies of the war we were then carrying on with the Birmese. In 1850, Sir James Brooke made an attempt to renew negociations with Siam. He did open them, but owing to the serious illness of the late King of Siam was unable to bring them to a satisfactory conclusion, and finally quitted the waters of Siam with little hope of future success in any attempt to establish commercial relations between the people of that country and his own. The antecedents of English diplomacy with Siam were not encouraging.

It was on the 24th of March, 1855, that Sir John Bowring reached the Bay of Siam in H. M. screw steam-ship the *Rattler*, followed by the *Grecian*, a brig of war. He fell in on that day with a fishing-boat, which gave but poor promise of Siamese civilization. It had a look of discomfort and savagery not calculated to produce a favourable first impression. The sailors on board—there were four of them—were all but naked—the sails of coarse cotton were full of holes—the furniture of the boat consisted of a few mats, and its only cargo was a few vegetables. On March 26th, the Rattler and its consort steamed (piloted by some natives whom they had picked up out of a Siamese boat) into the river of the city of Bangkok, which flows into the Bay. Arrived there, they first opened communications with certain custom-house officers, who, like other officials, were more ready to ask than to answer questions. They communicated, however, the important fact that the King was then at Bangkok. Notwithstanding his wonderful power over language, our Plenipotentiary had to communicate with these Siamese officials through various translations, first into Chinese, thence into Cantonese, thence into Fookien, and lastly there was an "overturning" into Siamese. Like the talk through the telegraph at home, this transmission of words through such various and strange *mediums*, must tend to simplify and compress the speaker's style. A deputation was sent on shore, headed by Mr. Parkes (a now not unfamiliar name in our Houses of Parliament). They found that Siam, like our own happy England, had its two parties—its Conservatives jealous of change, anxious to retain everything ancient and restrictive, and its Liberals eager for a progressive policy. March 28th brought to our Plenipotentiary a letter from the

King, in the Royal autograph and, still more surprising, in English. The style is sufficiently peculiar. His Majesty welcomes the arrival of his Excellency with "rejoyful pleasure." This letter was written by the King the very hour that he learnt the arrival of the strangers. He labours to express his instant welcome of them in these words: "I can not hesitate to send my gladful cordil more than an hour." We find in this and other letters of the King a somewhat arbitrary style. In them, as in Mrs. Malaprop's note, "many poor words are pressed into the service that would get their habeas corpus from any court in Christendom." But we may certainly say, with Sir Lucius O'Trigger, "When affection guides the pen, he must be a brute who finds fault with the style."

Siam has at present a "first" and "second King." The first King, Chau Fa Yai, or T. Y. Chau Fa Mongkut, is the reigning prince; the second King, Chau Fa Noi, is his younger brother. Both appear to be far from common men. Chau Fa Yai should have succeeded to his father's throne in 1824, but was put aside by his half-brother, born to his father by an inferior wife. The polygamy practised by the Royal house of Siam will excite the envy of a Mormon priest, and the wonder, but not the envy, of those English husbands who find their skill in domestic government sufficiently tasked in curbing one female will. The late Siamese usurper rejoiced in seven hundred wives. The present monarch has six hundred. Chau Fa Yai withdrew from contesting the throne, and, availing himself of the custom of the Siamese to devote themselves for a certain time to the priesthood, entered a *wat* (or temple), and thus avoided any necessity for prostration before his brother, and entitled himself to receive homage in his sacred character from the King himself. He remained nearly twenty-seven years in this political obscurity, but acquired a great religious reputation. He devoted his time to the most laborious studies, became a learned Pali scholar, and the President of the Board of Examiners into the proficiency of the priesthood in this sacred language; he acquired the Sanscrit, the Cingalese and the Peguan, and associated his name with the literary honours of the priestly hierarchy. He became to some extent a religious reformer, and, like the Vedanters in Bengal with reference to Brahminism, sought to purify the Buddhist faith by rejecting the enormous masses of tradition and fable, clinging to the moral instructions of Buddhism, and recognizing the principles of sound natural philosophy as regards the cosmogony of the universe.

"The King was taught Latin by the French Catholic missionaries, principally by Bishop Pallegoix. English he began to study in 1845, principally availing himself of the United States' missionaries. Mr. Carswell devoted a year and a half to instructing him four times a-week, one hour each lesson. He occupied himself with astronomical investi-

gations, and is able to calculate an eclipse, and the degrees of latitude and longitude. He has introduced a press, with both Siamese and English types. He was born Oct. 18, 1804, is of middle height, thin, with a somewhat austere countenance; his conversation is highly intelligent, but is carried on in the language of books rather than of ordinary colloquy."—I. 440, 441.

It was in 1851 that Chau Fa Yai succeeded to the throne on the death of his half-brother. He had during his long seclusion as a bonze religiously kept the vow of chastity. Since his ascending the throne, he has practised the polygamy sanctioned by the laws and usages of the country and by the Buddhist religion. Of the peculiar Siamese usage, the institution of a second King, and of the remarkable man now holding this rank, Sir John Bowring thus writes:

"He is not charged, as in the case of Japan, with the religious as distinguished from the civil functions of government, but exercises a species of secondary or reflected authority, the limits of which did not appear to me to be at all clearly defined. His title was formerly *Uparat*, but it is now *Wangna*,—literally meaning the junior king. He is said to dispose of one-third of the state revenue, and to have at his command an army of about 2000 men. He is generally a brother or near relation of the King. The present *Wangna*, as I have before mentioned, is a legitimate brother of the First King, a cultivated and intelligent gentleman, writing and speaking English with great accuracy, and living much in the style of a courteous and opulent European noble, fond of books and scientific inquiry, interested in all that marks the course of civilization. His palace is of nearly the some extent as that of the First King. In it is a building which he makes his principal abode, and which has the accommodation and adornings of a handsome European edifice. He is surrounded with the same royal insignia as the First King, though somewhat less ostentatiously displayed; and the same marks of honour and prostration are paid to his person. He has his ministers, corresponding to those of the First King, and is supposed to take a more active part in the wars of the country than does the First King. It is usual to consult him on all important affairs of state. * * * He is expected to pay visits of ceremony to the First King, and his salutation consists in elevating his hands; but the brothers sit together on terms of equality. There would seem some danger in the adjacency of sovereignties so likely to clash; and the late King abolished the *Wangna*ship, which was, however, restored by the present King and the whole body of nobles. The Second King appeared to me more occupied with philosophical pursuits than with state affairs; and probably such a course of abstention is both wise and prudent. The demands of the Second King on the exchequer must be submitted to the First King for approval, and on being sealed by him, are paid by the great treasurer."—I. 446, 447.

The progress of the negociations for the treaty were not uninterruptedly progressive. There were during his month's residence in Siam hours of mistrust and anxiety to our Plenipotentiary. While earnestly intent on the great object of his mission, he had to watch with scrupulous care all the little

details which belong to court ceremonials. To have foregone his rights in small matters, would, with Asiatics, jealous to the last degree and possessed of no little cunning, have been fatal to his essential authority. The King himself, so superior to the mass of his subjects, had his fears and little jealousies. The presence of the *Rattler* at Bangkok, the formality of the salute of twenty-one guns, and other matters of detail, caused him some uneasiness, and for a time retarded the progress of the treaty. Many arrangements had to be made before the court of Siam was properly prepared for the public reception of the representative of the Queen of England. It was not, in fact, accomplished till the middle of April. In the mean time, however, the negociations for the treaty were going on steadily, and Sir John Bowring found in the Prime Minister, Phra Kalahom, an honest coadjutor. The word Phra is a very common Siamese prefix of dignity, and Sir John Bowring conjectures that it is derived from or partakes of a common origin with the *Pharaoh* of antiquity. He adds,

"It is given in the Siamese Dictionaries as synonymous with God—ruler, priest, and teacher. It is, in fact, the word by which sovereignty and sanctity are associated in the popular mind. As the title *Divus* was appropriated by the Roman Emperor,—as in most monarchies a sort of sacredness is attached to the royal person,—the Orientals have made 'gods' of their kings, their heroes, and their sages, without any scruple. Image-worship is, in fact, only the materializing or incarnating of the idea of Deity."—I. 35, 36, note.

Phra Kalahom appears throughout the negociations a man of great political wisdom, personal frankness and lucid candour, wonderful in a statesman of any country, thrice wonderful in an Asiatic diplomatist. Here are passages from the Journal descriptive of the talk of our countryman with this clear-headed and sound-hearted Siamese statesman.

"He said the existing system was very ruinous and bad, that the people were overtaxed and unhappy, and that the best thing would be to get rid of all the monopolies—that they were pernicious to the country, that the trade was reduced to nothing. * * * He said the principal opponents were the nobles, who are interested in the existing state of things, and who would not be willing to surrender their privileges. * * * He eschewed delay; he said, if it depended upon him, everything should be settled in two hours. * * * I told him much depended upon himself. He said his heart and wishes were with me; that, for the good of the people, he desired a total change: he was very busy, but would at any time see me—best in the evening—to discuss matters, and do all that could be done. Either he is a consummate hypocrite, or a true patriot: in any case, he is a most sagacious man, towering far above every other person whom we have met—of graceful, gentlemanly manners, and appropriate language. * * * The personal character of the prime minister is to me an object of much admiration. He is the most distinguished man of the greatest family in the empire; he was the main

instrument which placed the present King upon the throne against the claims of the late King's son, and was made prime minister. He has again and again told me that if my policy is to save the people from oppression and the country from monopoly, he shall labour with me, and if I succeed my name will be blest to all ages. He unveils abuses to me without disguise, and often with vehement eloquence. If he prove true to his profession, he is one of the noblest and most enlightened patriots the Oriental world has ever seen. He is careless about wealth, and says money is an anxiety to him, so he spends it profusely: he explained all the difficulties of his position, even as regarded the other members of his own family. To him Siam owes her fleet of merchant-ships."—II. 281, 282, 304.

The Phra Kalahom proved his honesty and patriotism by the speedy result of the negociations, and on the 18th of April, 1855, a treaty of friendship and commerce between Her Majesty and the Kings of Siam was signed at Bangkok. Our Plenipotentiary succeeded, after much difficulty, in securing the important point, that the treaty was to be interpreted by the text of the English, not the Siamese, version. In securing this point, the fortunate accident of the knowledge of our language by the two Kings doubtless helped. The treaty contains 12 articles, securing the mutual protection in Great Britain and its dependencies and in Siam of the subjects of each power, the residence at Bangkok of a British consul, free trade to British subjects in all the ports of Siam (their residence being restricted to Bangkok), the free exercise of the Christian religion in Siam and power to build churches by British subjects. The treaty also regulates the duties payable to the Siamese authorities, the British in this, as in all other matters, being put into the same position as Siamese and Chinese traders. This important and most satisfactory treaty took effect from April 6, 1856. The possible and not improbable effects of our relations with Siam on those we may hereafter succeed in establishing with the empire of China, is a subject of deeply interesting speculation. We cannot do too much to make our alliance beneficial to Siam. The Chinese, jealous and contemptuous as they are towards foreigners, may possibly be taught to entertain better thoughts of the "barbarians" when they see that Siam is strengthened, improved, enriched and civilized by continued and friendly intercourse with the British. If it is God's will that Siam shall have a succession of Kings and Prime Ministers as farseeing and patriotic as King Mongkut and Phra Kalahom his minister, it is not unreasonable to anticipate a glorious future for the kingdom of Siam. Blessed with a beautiful climate, the most healthful and delicious in the tropics, with fertility in its soil, the land traversed by rivers, and the coast indented with bays and studded with ports, it may become in the course of time, under indirect European influences, as powerful in relation to the great continent of Asia, as England is in relation to that of Europe. The

products of Siam are such as give promise of a great and increasing trade. They can send us rice,* sugar, aloes, gutta-percha, cardamums, gamboge, bamboo, the rattan, rak (a species of banana), cocoa-nuts, an endless variety of fruits, vegetables and flowers, ivory, the skins of wild animals, the turtle, gold, silver, tin, copper, lead, antimony, zinc, iron, oil, the horns of the rhinoceros and the stag, rosin, rosewood, teak-wood, sapan-wood, cotton, indigo, tobacco, tortoiseshell, feathers, ginger and hemp. In return, the Siamese will gladly receive the various produce of our looms in Lancashire, and of our busy workshops in Birmingham and Sheffield. The implements of agriculture may be expected to be favourite articles of import. Nothing can be more rude than the present system of Siamese agriculture. The soil, alluvial and rich—the climate, both moist and hot, secure fertility under *any* cultivation. The preparation of the land is often barbarous enough. Herds of buffaloes are turned upon it during the rainy season; the weeds they trample down, the upper surface of the soil they somewhat disturb; then a coarse rake, sometimes *au naturel*, constructed out of a thorn-bush, harrows the land; and after this rude preparation the seed is sown broadcast upon the surface. If with such cultivation as this a profitable crop is the result, what may not be effected by sub-soil ploughing, draining, and the other arts of an advanced agriculture? If the population of Siam is at present deficient, China is at hand with its superabundant millions; and with Chinese industry and horticulture, even the jungle of Siam may be made to blossom as the rose. "There can be no doubt," Sir John Bowring says, "that, under the influence of peace and commerce, vast districts will be subjected to the beneficent sway of the husbandman."

We must reserve for a second article much that has greatly interested us in these able volumes, and will devote what little space we still have to a few extracts from the personal Journal. Here is a part of the description of the grand audience which our Plenopotentiary had at the court of Siam on the 16th of April. The whole is told with graphical and pictorial skill.

"On entering the hall, we found it crowded with nobles, all prostrate, and with their faces bent to the ground. I walked forward through the centre of the hall to a cushion provided for me in a line with the very highest nobles not of royal blood: the prime minister and his brother were close to me on my right hand. The King came in, and seated himself on an elevated and gorgeous throne like the curtained box of a

* In respect to this, Sir John Bowring well observes,—"The removal of the prohibition on the export of rice is one of the great benefits conferred by the late treaty. It is now allowed to leave the country, unless a royal ordinance shall proclaim the existence of a dearth; but as already *the prospect of large foreign demands is extending the field of cultivation*, free trade in this all-important article will certainly give more security against the visitations of famine than could ever be hoped for from any restriction upon its exportation."—I. 203.

theatre. He was clad in golden garments, his crown at his side; but he wore on his head a cap decorated with large diamonds, and enormous diamond rings were on his fingers. At my left, nearer the throne, were the King's brothers and his sons; at the right, the princes of the blood, the Somdetches, and the higher nobles. The nobility crowded the hall, all on their knees; and on the entrance of the King, his throne being raised about ten feet from the floor, they all bent their foreheads to the ground, and we sat down as gracefully as we could while the prostrations were repeated again and again. Very agreeable music continued to be played; it sank into silence, and I addressed the King in a speech, which I read, thanking his Majesty for the cordial welcome I had received, for the facilities he had afforded me in giving prompt and effectual aid in furtherance of the objects of my Mission, and expressing my confidence that the conditions of the treaty would add to the lustre of a name already distinguished among Western nations, and conduce to the permanent prosperity of the two contracting powers, and of the world at large. This was put into Siamese, and read aloud by the prime minister's brother. The King made rather a long speech, which was an account of various embassies to Siam. He said, it was only of late years that they had become acquainted with the greatness of England and the value of the alliance. * * * He said, we must not expect too much from Siam—it was mostly a jungle. I answered, that commerce would make the jungle a garden, and that my own now-cultivated country was once almost a wilderness. He said, 'Your country is a garden.' I answered, 'we owed our progress to trade.' He said he should write to the Queen of England, and asked me to take charge of the letter, which I expressed my anxiety to do. * * * The reception must have lasted half an hour, when the King withdrew, and a golden curtain was let down before the throne on which he had been seated. The nobles rose, and we were greeted by such of them as we personally knew. There was again a chorus of music, and in which innumerable drums took part; and I received a message from the King that he wished to see me quite alone.

"I was conducted through a court of the palace, and found the King, divested of his royal robes, sitting behind a latticed window at a considerable height above me, while I stood on a carpet below. A chair was soon brought, and his Majesty read a copy of my speech aloud, and was pleased to pay me many compliments about it: he said, when I spoke it he did not clearly understand all its meaning, but now he understood every word, and that every word was appropriate, and such as he should have wished me to say. He asked me if there were any productions of Siam I wished to possess, for they were quite at my service, and he would send them. He said I should have what plants I wished, and ordered that two young elephants should be presented to me, if I would take charge of them. He directed a lithograph of the white elephant to be given me, and then sent for his youngest-born, a girl of eight months, and having fondled it, asked if I did not think it handsome—which it really was: it was quite naked, and I saw no ornament except a small coronal of white flowers upon its head. I asked his Majesty how many children he had: he answered—'Eleven since I was King, and twelve before—plenty of royalty.' It was a pretty sight to see a despotic monarch, before whom I had just witnessed the

whole nobility of the land in a state of prostrate adoration, dandling and smiling upon a little child."—II. 308—312.

The whole scenery of Siam appears to abound in beauty. The short description of the scenery of the Bangkok river is charming enough.

"The appearance of the river is beautiful, crowded with the richest vegetation to the water's edge. Now and then a bamboo hut is seen amidst the foliage, whose varieties of bright and beautiful green no art could copy. Fruits and flowers hang by thousands on the branches. We observed that even the wild animals were scarcely scared by our approach. Fishes glided over the mud-banks, and birds either sat looking at us as we passed, or winged their way around and above us. The almost naked people sat and looked at us as we glided by; and their habitations were generally marked out by a small creek, with a rude boat and one or more pariah dogs. As we approached Bangkok, floating houses became more and more numerous. They are raised on piles of bamboos and moored to the shores: they are the shops and bazaars as well as the dwellings of the inhabitants. In front of some of the superior edifices we observed a great number of ladies waiting to see the procession, among whom the wives of the Phra Klang" (the colleague in office of the Phra Kalahom) "were pointed out to us. Many of the priests (talapoins) sat upon the rafts and wharves before their temples. We had remarked one solitary talapoin steering a miserable boat. * * * The fire-flies were visible in sparkling multitudes. The almost human voice of the Geeko lizard was frequently heard. The crows cawed loudly, and the pariah dogs barked more loudly still. There seems in these tropical climates such a wonderful vitality in animal and vegetable life, such a power and an enjoyment, that man counts for less than elsewhere in the great scale of nature. An insect, an animal, a tree, are very different existences from what we see them in our all-depressing climes."—II. 265—267.

The details which these volumes give us of religious rites and opinions are particularly curious and valuable. It is not often that the rites of heathens are observed and their opinions inquired into by one combining the world-wide knowledge on these topics of Sir John Bowring, and not always do our countrymen carry into foreign houses of prayer his charitable spirit. We may mention in passing that he was enabled to mediate with the King on behalf of the missionaries of the United States now in Siam. In consequence of some offence they had given to the native authorities by supposed interference with Siamese matters, restrictions had been put on them in travelling from place to place. The King granted the Englishman's prayer, and removed the restrictions. Dr. Bradley and the American missionaries were profoundly grateful, and delicately shewed their sense of the kindness by chanting in their religious service, when Sir John Bowring was a worshiper with them, one of his beautiful devotional poems, "Thy Will be Done." The anecdote is interesting. The hymn of an English Unitarian chanted in his presence by

American "orthodox" missionaries, in the midst of idolatrous Asiatics! At home, perhaps some of these good missionaries would have shrunk from religious contact with an Unitarian; but under the dark shadow of the temple of Buddha, they could see in a brother Protestant only a fellow-christian! Here are some slight sketches, taken from different parts of the Journals, of the temples and priests of Siam, and the moral influence of the Buddhist faith.

"The walls of the temples are covered with paintings, religious and historical. The priests were never uncivil, but often looked at us with a vacant, uninteresting stare. It is their profession to be indifferent to worldly things, and the *show* of contemplation is to a great extent the *substance* of religious character. When that character resolves into deep abstracted musings, what is its real value to mankind? It is but gross egotism, evidencing the religious sentiments in no benevolent or beneficent shape; for who is the better for the unrevealed thoughts or undivulged meditations even of the profoundest philosophers? * * *

"The most characteristic part of the Siamese social system is the position of the priesthood, commonly called the talapoins. While everything else is prostrate before authority, they appear, multitudinous though they are, the objects of universal reverence. Though living upon alms, they bend to no superior. They exhibit the utmost disregard to all external objects, and appear reduced to the condition of ambulatory statues. In the temples they personify an absolute self-absorption, and scarcely turn their eyes on any object, however novel or exciting. On the whole, the expression of their countenances is vulgar and unintellectual. Their contemplative habits seem the annihilation, instead of the development, of mental action. To say the best, their religion is but harmless and useless—a dream instead of a life, and a life unavailing as a dream. A few such might not exercise a very pernicious influence; but when a whole nation is impregnated with the notion that such an unmeaning existence is the most acceptable tribute that can be offered to the Supreme Spirit, it would seem impossible that any active or operative civilization should stir up the elements of competition, or effect any permanent and general improvement. * * * In one of the temples we saw the impress of Buddha's foot, in which there were offerings of a small silver Buddha clad in yellow, and a few fragrant flowers were strewed. On one of the walls, the horrible pictures of the Buddhist hells were painted. * * A glutton was seen reduced to starvation; a winebibber was laid on his back, exposed to the burning sun; a liar had his tongue cut; an incompetent doctor was being squeezed to death under the stone with which they prepare their medicines. Flaying, scalping, burning alive, and multitudinous other horrid forms of death, were being inflicted, most of them having reference to some particular crime committed in the body.—The priests were returning from their collection of rice and betel—most of them carry an iron pot and wallet. We see people standing in the street giving them these offerings as they pass; the giver bent on his knees, the priests exhibiting no thankfulness nor even complacency towards their benefactors. How can a nation be elevated under the influences of such a religious system—and how is a religious system to be rooted

out of the national mind, in which it forms a part almost of existence itself?"

Of the supplanting of Buddhism by Christianity, there seems at present no rational probability. The missionaries make no converts among the native population. The King is desirous of reforming the religion of his subjects; but Buddhism is not a good foundation for a policy which is to regenerate a people.

"It is reported of the King that he had determined to found a reformed system of Buddhism, which should recognize the existence of an all-creating, all-controlling God, and purify Buddhism from the corruptions and traditions of the priests. He once said to the missionaries, in speaking of the creation of the world, 'How could the world have been made without a Maker, whom you call God, and others call by other names?"

The picture which the following anecdote and allegory give us of the King during his enforced seclusion, previous to his assumption of the throne of Siam, is one which may put to shame most Christian monarchs. The story rests on the authority of one of the missionaries.

"The King, when a bonze, and carrying on his studies in the temple to which he retreated, had gathered around him many young men, whom he was fond of instructing in European sciences, and encouraging them to study the progress of knowledge. He illustrated his views by the following allegory:—Two men start from the jungle loaded with the coarse articles it produces—the fibres of the hemp, for example: they move onwards, and come to a place where there is more valuable material, as cotton. The foolish and unimproveable man persists in carrying his coarse and unprofitable burden of hemp; his wiser companion exchanges his hemp for the finer and more valuable material. They still move on, and come to a silk district. The fool sticks to his hemp, the wise barters his cotton for silk: and thus they reach the end of their journey, one exhausted with carrying an almost worthless and heavy load, the other having brought with ease a profitable and valuable investment."—II. 336, 337.

REVERENCE FOR ANTIQUITY.

Is there not, then, some reason for the ridicule which Bacon speaks of as attaching to those "who too much reverence old times"? To say that no changes shall take place is to talk idly. We might as well pretend to control the motions of the earth. To resolve that none shall take place *except* what are undesigned and accidental, is to resolve that though a clock may gain or lose indefinitely, at least we will take care that it shall never be regulated. "If time" (to use Bacon's warning words) "alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"—Archbishop Whately.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A Plan by which the Education of the People may be secured without State Interference or compulsory Rating, and in strict Accordance with the Principles of Religious Liberty. By Thomas Wrigley. Pp. 72. 1857.

In its earnest and constant advocacy of universal education, the *Christian Reformer* has maintained the Secular principle as the true one to adopt, whether for joint voluntary efforts or for State assistance;—the very same Secular principle on which the comfortable classes of society do, in fact, provide for the day-school instruction of their own children, without ever suspecting that they are irreligious in so doing.

Not endorsing the ultra voluntaryism which objects to public taxation for this end, we have welcomed the help of the Council of Education, while regretting the self-imposed restrictions on their usefulness, and especially their determination to court all the religious sects in turn, instead of recognizing the schools simply as secular schools, and knowing nothing of the religious dogmas superadded in each.

On the question of *compulsory* education (in the Prussian sense of compulsion), we have never been able to put aside our English notions of freedom, and our conviction of the superior healthiness and worth of such instruction as is freely sought, to that which is enforced by statecraft. But neither have we doubted that legislation might fairly be so directed as to supply additional inducements of a most healthy kind for the acquisition of instruction, nor have we failed to welcome such interference as the State has already made between the cupidity of parents and the bodily and mental health of their children, by restricting the age at which the latter shall be allowed to work for wages, and the number of hours per day that they shall be employed. That this has been done only in certain employments, and perhaps cannot be effected in all without exception, does not invalidate the propriety of doing it where it is practicable.

Mr. Wrigley proposes to carry out this moral compulsion more thoroughly, by making it, as far as possible, the interest (and almost the necessity) of sordid parents, in the factory districts at least, and wherever else practicable, to provide education for their children, as the condition on which alone the latter can be allowed to earn wages.

His pamphlet is an enlargement and fuller explanation of the plan proposed by him nearly two years ago in his "Letters to Lord Stanley," of which we took notice in C. R. at the time of their publication.* He here recapitulates his plan as then proposed, which is as follows:

"I contend, *First*, That it is no part of the duty of the State to PROVIDE Education for the people, any more than it is to feed and clothe them.

"*Second.* That it is wrong to relieve one part of the community from their natural responsibilities (except under special circumstances), at the expense of the rest.

"*Third.* That it is inexpedient and bad economy to ask a Government to assume the office of public instructor; because from all experience we find that whatever Government undertakes, compared with the result of private efforts, it executes inefficiently and at a much greater cost.

"*Fourth.* That any system of national or general Education, under the

* See C. R., 1855, p. 574.

control and direction of Government, in which religious instruction is deemed an essential part, is incompatible with civil and religious liberty.

"*Fifth.* That every parent has an indefeasible right to direct and superintend the education of his child, and that the sole duty of the State in reference to it is, to hold him responsible for, and if necessary to compel, the performance of this obligation.

"*Sixth.* That the want of means on the part of parents is not THE obstacle in the way of Education, which is rather their want of appreciation of the thing itself, combined with the strong temptation they have to benefit themselves at the expense of their children, by the sale of their labour.

"*Seventh.* That self-interest on the part of parents, arising from the facilities that exist for the employment of juvenile labour, and the high price which is paid for it, constitutes the permanent motive force which defies every effort of the philanthropist, and which carries the child away from school to work in the field or in the factory.

"*Eighth.* That, in order to neutralize the motive, which thus operates to deprive the child of its natural rights, and to prevent parents neglecting the Education of their children to benefit themselves, it is a proper exercise of the power of Government to present a legal obstacle to its gratification, and for this purpose to prohibit the employment of infant labour, except under certain restrictions.

"*Ninth.* That in order to give parents a direct interest in the Education of their children, it is necessary to make it the basis of their right to dispose of their labour.

"*Tenth.* That in order to secure the co-operation of all who are interested in the employment of infant labour, it is necessary to prohibit the employment of every child under a certain age, say eight to ten years; and that after that period it shall only be employed on the production of a certificate granted by a public officer after examination, showing that it has arrived at a certain standard of elementary Education; and that a breach of this regulation shall subject both parent and employer to certain legal penalties.

"*Eleventh.* That the innocent may not suffer for the guilty, the restrictive power of the law shall cease after the age of sixteen years, or such other period as the child may be deemed in a condition to act independently of its parents; and that it shall be competent for the examiner, when there is mental incapacity to attain the required standard of elementary Education, and yet sufficient bodily strength to labour, to give a special certificate to that effect.

"*Twelfth.* That poverty may be no excuse for ignorance, it is necessary to bring into operation that benevolent legislative provision, which secures to every one the means of existence; and thereby to give the same security for the means of Education. Thus when it can be shown that the means of the parent are insufficient to defray the cost of education, aid should in such cases be granted from the public funds, by a board specially constituted for educational purposes; the board to take such security for the proper expenditure of the money supplied, by certificates of school attendance, as the circumstances would admit of, but leaving to the parent a free choice in the selection of the school.

"Such is a brief digest of the objections I advanced to National Education, as based upon State provision; and also the plan by which I propose to accomplish the same end, as contained in my two Letters addressed to Lord Stanley."—Pp. 35—37.

Mr. Wrigley's great principle is, to induce or compel the parents to fulfil their often neglected duty towards their children, instead of releasing them from this natural obligation, as the State educationist does by undertaking to educate their children for them.

"If every parent fulfilled his duty to his children, there would be no case for Government interference, no necessity for any movement in regard to

Education; and it is precisely because this is not done, and because ignorance which is thus brought about by the deliberate and wilful neglect of this duty by individuals, is supposed to have a prejudicial influence upon society, that the necessity for Government action has arisen. One would have thought that the obvious remedy for such a state of things, would have been to ascertain who are the defaulters; who are they who thus neglect the education of their children, and what are the reasons and the motives which induce them to neglect so manifest a duty. Instead of this, we hear of nothing but proposals to relieve them from their obligations, and transfer the duty and the burden to others."—P. 41.

Amongst his own people and in his immediate neighbourhood, Mr. Wrigley "found that it was no question of want of means to perform the duty: that it was neglected quite as commonly where the means were in undoubted abundance, as where there might be a presumed deficiency." He "found it was the *interest* of the parent to neglect the education of his child," by sending him to earn wages instead.

"I therefore came to the conclusion, that were all other obstacles surmounted, so as to give a practical effect to the desires of the associated bodies, yet so long as the interest of the parent remained in antagonism to that of the child, so long as duty was contending single-handed with selfishness, it was quite hopeless to expect any change in favour of the child. I therefore arrived at the conviction, that the 'permissive principle' the enabling facilities, upon which the two societies [the Secular and its rival] relied in common, would not meet the difficulty. I foresaw that by the adoption of either the one plan or the other, we should succeed in establishing an organised system of centralized power, having its source in the Government, which would result in extending Government patronage, dispensing a large amount of public money, without producing any sensible effect in extending the Education of the rising generation."—Pref. v. vi.

In confirmation of these opinions, Mr. W. quotes abundant facts supplied by school inspectors and clergymen. The Cheadle case is decisive:

"Mr. Marshall, in his report for the Southern Division of the kingdom, says, 'It is no part of my duty to determine why so large a proportion of children neglect to embrace the advantages now offered to them, or use them for so short a period, and with such imperfect results. The explanation is not, however, hard to find. The children themselves are naturally slow to appreciate the value of Education, and their parents are either profoundly indifferent, or stubbornly hostile. * * * Nor can it ever excite the least surprise in any reasonable mind, that in districts where the child of necessitous parents can obtain for them 6*s.* per week, at seven years of age, the school population should be insignificant and fluctuating. The teacher's modest invitation is overpowered by the louder tones of the master and employer, and schools remain empty that mines and factories may be thronged. During the last year, more than one painful example of the triumph of factories over schools, where they come into conflict, has fallen under my observation. At Cheadle, in Staffordshire, where there are very beautiful schools, erected by the munificent liberality of the late Earl of Shrewsbury, and where, two years ago, there was a very large attendance of children, attracted by teaching of an unusually high order, I found at my last visit, that *the numbers had dwindled to less than one-half.* The explanation will be anticipated. In the interval, a factory had been established, and the energetic proprietor' (why not say the ignorant and selfish parent?) 'had gained an easy victory over the devoted but defenceless teachers; wages had made short work of Education.'

"Here is a plain statement, showing that Education prospered in the absence of the factory, and therefore, with the smaller means of the parents;

but, the moment that the opportunity offers whereby the parent could benefit himself, he seizes it, regardless of the welfare of his child. It is as the Nottinghamshire Incumbent says, 'No increase in the quantity or quality of the Education offered, will in any degree meet the evil, which proceeds from the want of appetite, or rather, the greedy appetite for money.'"—Pp. 63, 64.

The very remedy advocated by Mr. Wrigley is indeed endorsed, if it was not suggested (for there is no date quoted), by the Rev. W. J. Kennedy, in his Government Report for Lancashire and the Isle of Man, who says,—

"There are many persons who despair of getting the children of the poor regularly to school, save by some compulsory enactment. There is no doubt, I think, that this opinion, whether rightly or wrongly, is gaining ground. The only form and shape in which compulsion could be applied at once, to all the children of our labouring classes, would be by an enactment, prohibiting the employment of children under a certain age, in any regular remunerative work, unless they had obtained a certain definite amount of attainments, such amount of Education being certified by a proper officer. In this case, it would be necessary that officers should be appointed in towns, to whom parents could bring their children, at set times, for examination, and from whom they could receive the requisite certificate. The penalty might be a fine upon any parties employing an uncertificated child, and also upon the parent."—Pp. 64, 65.

Mr. Wrigley's plan differs only in appointing travelling examiners instead of resident ones.

In our notice of Mr. Wrigley's former pamphlet, we objected to his reliance upon sectarian zeal for the formation of schools. He probably alludes to us in the following remarks, by which it is clear that he holds with us the superior wisdom of the secular school plan, while, trusting as he does to the voluntary formation of schools chiefly, he is obliged to take what the sects will give him.

"Lord Stanley may be of opinion, that little real good is effected by teaching doctrinal tenets to the very young, and I may and do acquiesce in that opinion; nevertheless, the feeling of the country is against us. It is not only useless to contend against this national sentiment, but it would be wrong to attempt it. This being the case, I look upon the way in which Education is secured by this plan, without interfering with the free exercise of religious opinions, as a feature that makes it pre-eminently fitted for our peculiar institutions. Notwithstanding this, I have been charged with relying for the success of the plan upon Sectarianism, because, in sketching its operation, I speculated upon the probability of sectarian rivalry providing gratuitous Education for many of those belonging to peculiar denominations, who might be unable to supply the means of Education for their children. This is not a fair inference from what I did say, nor is it what I meant. I do not rely upon Sectarianism. The plan I have proposed is based upon a principle that will secure the object, whether Sectarianism aid in the work or not, and in alluding to it, I merely stated what I thought would be the case, rather than what I wished to be. Sectarianism may be a good or an evil. I, like other men who have thought upon such subjects, have my own opinion; but this is no place for expressing it. Whether we like it or not, Sectarianism is amongst us, extending and diffusing itself throughout society. It is the outward manifestation, the natural consequence of the religious freedom we enjoy. It would be a difficult matter to prevent men who think alike upon any subject, from acting in concert. Be this as it may, Sectarianism has established itself as the recognised form of dispensing religious truth,—and if this system, from whatever motive, tend to the spread of elementary Education, I for one shall raise no objection to it; but again I say, I do not rely upon it. I rely upon

a more worldly, and if the truth must be spoken, a more powerful principle, namely, the self-interest of those to whom the duty of providing Education for the young rightfully belongs; though I am still of opinion, that large provision will be made for gratuitous instruction, for the children of those who are unable to pay for it, at the schools in connection with the various religious denominations."—Pp. 57, 58.

Another of our objections to Mr. Wrigley's scheme as first proposed applied then, and does still, equally to the operations of the Privy Council,—namely, that there is no supply of educational facilities offered for the very places where they are most wanted—for the poorest districts, that is, of town and country. But this, while it may be a defect in Mr. Wrigley's semi-voluntaryism, as it is in Mr. Baines's supposed thorough voluntaryism, is a sin of first magnitude in the Government plan, which

> "makes its testament
> As worldlings do, giving its sum of more
> To that which had too much;"

or, at least, gives most to the districts and sects that can raise most for themselves, and leaves the most needy to their unmitigated need.

We quite agree with Mr. Wrigley in deprecating the bureaucratical, formal and ponderous ways of the Council of Education, and are by no means ready to hail the recent Packington and Manchester compromise as an effectual settlement of our educational difficulties. Such vigorous and healthy thought as his is much more to our liking, though we should be willing still to employ State resources for the formation of schools where voluntaryism is insufficient, while joining with him in the endeavour to throw upon the parents, wherever practicable, the obligation which they have been too much encouraged to shirk. His manly thoughts and nervous utterance ought to find fit audience among Englishmen and English statesmen.

Archbishop Whately's Edition of Bacon's Essays. Second Edition, revised. London—Parker. 1857.

The attention which some of the best minds of the present age are disposed to give to the writings of Lord Bacon, is one of the hopeful signs of the times. Wisdom is the essential attribute of Bacon's Essays, and they are clothed in language which, though constructed two centuries and a half ago, may for purity and force still be regarded as a model. The fact that the popularity of Bacon's Essays has not grown rusty with time, but has increased in brightness with increasing knowledge and refinement, should act as a warning to our would-be fine writers of philosophy of the present day. Let them learn from it that simplicity of style is quite consistent with profound thought, and that the "pure well of English undefiled" is acceptable alike to simple and learned, and will be prized as much centuries hence as now; while the affected prettinesses, the laborious obscurities, the barbarous new-coined phrases, and, above all, the perpetual *slang* which defaces modern books, and which now pass with the vulgar in literature as proofs of profundity, will be regarded hereafter (if indeed they are regarded at all) with as little admiration as the affectations of Lilly and his Euphues, and other writers of the same class of the times of Elizabeth and James. In the Preface to this thoughtful and sterling volume, Dr. Whately makes some admirable remarks on the tendency to regard with excessive ad-

miration writers whose characteristic is, unlike our great English philosophers, Bacon and Locke, "a mystical, dim, half intelligible kind of affected grandeur."

"It is well known what a reproach to our climate is the prevalence of fogs, and how much more of risk and inconvenience results from that mixture of light and obscurity than from the darkness of night. But let any one imagine to himself, if he can, a mist so resplendent with gay prismatic colours, that men should forget its inconveniences in their admiration of its beauty, and that a kind of nebular taste should prevail for preferring that gorgeous dimness to vulgar daylight; nothing short of this could afford a parallel to the mischief done to the public mind by some late writers both in England and America,—a sort of 'Children of the Mist,' who bring forward their speculations—often very silly, and not seldom very mischievous—under cover of the twilight. They have accustomed their disciples to admire as a style sublimely philosophical what may best be described as a certain haze of words imperfectly understood, through which some seemingly original ideas, scarcely distinguishable in their outlines, *loom* as it were on the view, in a kind of dusky magnificence that greatly exaggerates their real dimensions. In the October No. of the *Edinburgh Review*, 1851 (p. 513), the reviewer, though evidently disposed to regard with some favour a style of dim and mystical sublimity, remarks, that 'a strange notion which many have adopted of late years is, that a poem cannot be profound unless it is in whole or in part obscure; the people like their prophets to foam and speak in riddles.' But the reviewer need not have confined his remark to poetry; a similar taste prevails in reference to prose writers also. 'I have ventured,' says the late Bishop Copleston (in a letter published in the Memoir of him by his nephew), 'to give the whole class the appellation of the '*magic-lanthorn school*,' for their writings have the startling effect of that toy; children delight in it, and grown people soon get tired of it.'"—Preface, p. v.

In illustration of the kind of writing to which he objects, the Archbishop brings forward passages from "modern works in some repute." The selected passages look as though they were taken from Coleridge, Theodore Parker, and an English living writer of kindred taste. One of the passages selected as a specimen of the "magic-lanthorn" style of writing is this:

"The very word Miracle, as pronounced by Christian churches, gives a false impression; it is a monster; it is not one with the blowing clover and the falling rain..... Man's life is a miracle and all that man doth..... A true conversion, a true Christ, is now as always to be made by the reception of beautiful sentiments..... The gift of God to the soul is not a vaunting, overpowering, excluding sanctity, but a sweet natural goodness, like thine and mine, and that thus invites thine and mine to be and to grow."

Of the half-dozen passages selected by Dr. Whately to illustrate what he considers a vicious style, no less than four of them remind us of a class of writers whom some amongst us especially admire. Now believing, as we certainly do, that the objections taken to this kind of writing are well founded, and will, after the rage of a new fashion has spent itself and the thing has passed away, be the prevailing opinion of thoughtful persons of cultivated taste, we ask the attention of our readers to the remarks which follow.

"Now without presuming to insinuate that such passages as these convey no distinct meaning to *any* reader, or to the writer, it may safely be maintained that to above ninety-nine hundredths—including, probably, many who admire them as profoundly wise—they are very dimly, if at all, intelligible. If the writers of them were called on to explain their meaning, as Mr. Bayes

is in *The Rehearsal*, they might perhaps confess as frankly as he does that the object was merely 'to elevate and surprise.'

"One may often hear some writers of the 'magic-lanthorn school' spoken of as possessing wonderful *power*, even by those who regret that this power is not better employed. 'It is pity,' we sometimes hear it said, 'that such an author does not express in simple, intelligible, unaffected English such admirable matter as his.' They little think that it is the strangeness and obscurity of the style that make the power displayed seem far greater than it is; and that much of what they now admire as originality and profound wisdom, would appear, if translated into common language, to be mere commonplace matter. * * * They are most of them willing to take it for granted, with an implicit faith, that what seems such *hard* thinking must be very accurate and original thinking also. What is abstruse and recondite, they suppose must be abstruse and recondite wisdom; though perhaps it is what, if stated in plain English, they would throw aside as partly trifling truisms, and partly stark folly. It is a remark which I have heard highly applauded, that a *clear* idea is generally a *little* idea; for there are not a few persons who estimate the depth of thought as an unskilful eye would estimate the depth of water. Muddy water is apt to be supposed deeper than it is, because you cannot see to the bottom; very clear water, on the contrary, will always seem less deep than it is, both from the well-known law of refraction, and also because it is so thoroughly penetrated by the sight. Men fancy that an idea must have been always obvious to every one, when they find it so plainly presented to the mind that every one can easily take it in. An explanation that is perfectly clear, satisfactory and simple, often causes the unreflecting to forget that they had needed any explanation at all. And truths that are in practice frequently overlooked, they will deride as 'vapid truisms' if very *plainly* set forth, and will wonder that any one should think it worth while to notice them."

Lord Bacon understood and imitated the exquisite simplicity of nature. He made it his work to interrogate and to interpret nature, and in his own *translation* he imitated the simplicity of the original. The Proverbs of Solomon, the Sermon on the Mount, and Bacon's Essays, have by their unaffected simplicity of diction been the delight of children and peasants, while they have furnished topics of deep thought to philosophers and divines.

"Bacon is a striking instance of a genius who could think so profoundly, and at the same time so clearly, that an ordinary man understands readily most of his wisest sayings, and perhaps thinks them so self-evident as hardly to need mention. But on reconsideration and repeated meditation, you perceive more and more what extensive and important applications one of his maxims will have, and how often it has been overlooked; and on returning to it again and again, fresh views of its importance will continually open on you. One of his sayings will be like some of the heavenly bodies that are visible to the naked eye, but in which you see continually more and more the better the telescope you apply to them. The 'dark sayings,' on the contrary, of some admired writers, may be compared to a fog-bank at sea, which the navigator at first glance takes for a chain of majestic mountains, but which when approached closely, or when viewed through a good glass, proves to be a mere mass of unsubstantial vapours."—Preface, p. x.

We have left ourselves little space to speak of the annotations and parallel passages which enrich this edition of the Essays. They have been, like other good things, of slow growth. From time to time Dr. Whately has been wont to write down the observations which occurred to him when reading the Essays, and also to refer to parallel passages in other authors. The gradual result is before us in this suggestive and instructive volume. Dr. Whately's annotations on Bacon shew

him to be a discriminating critic, not a blind hero-worshiper. He does not conceal his author's limited and inaccurate knowledge of natural philosophy and natural history, and he points out instances where even the vision of the philosopher was contracted by the prejudices of his age, and his wisdom cramped by the idol-worship which in his own matchless Organon he demolished.

The essay on "Unity in Religion" is one in which we see something of Bacon's strength, but more of his weakness. It is a pleasant thing to read in the annotations of a Protestant Archbishop wholesome truths like these: that the unity spoken of in the Christian Scriptures does not mean agreement in doctrine, nor that all Christians must belong to some one society on earth; that this was what the apostles never aimed at; that Party corrupts the conscience by making almost all virtues flow, as it were, in its own channel; and that the noblest principles of conduct may be perverted by Party to its own purposes; and that the conscience may, under the influence of Party, become so corrupted as to be a guide to evil rather than good. Bacon had some perception of the rights of conscience; but his annotator doubts, properly enough, whether the Chancellor had realized to his mind the principle that *all* secular coercion, small or great, in what regards religious faith, is contrary to the spirit of Christianity. When Bacon said, "We may not take up Mahomet's sword, or like unto it; that is to propagate religion by wars, or by sanguinary persecutions to force conscience,"—he was probably much before the wisdom of his age—certainly before that of his Monarch, who loved to harry his Puritan subjects, and burnt the poor Arian who was too well read in the New Testament, and too honest, to be converted to the orthodox faith by the sorry arguments of the Scottish Solomon. But advanced as Bacon was in his ideas, he had not attained to the principle which alone prevents religious persecution,—that religion does not fall within the province of the civil magistrate. Admirable is Dr. Whately's note on this subject:

"If we are to understand and comply with, in the simple and obvious sense, our Lord's injunction to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's, and his declaration that his kingdom is not of this world,—and if we are to believe his apostles sincere in renouncing, on behalf of themselves and their followers, all design of propagating their faith by secular force, or of monopolizing for Christians as such, or for any particular denomination of Christians, secular power and political rights,—then *all* penalties and privations, great or small, inflicted on purely religious grounds, must be equally of the character of persecution (though all are not equally *severe* persecution), and all alike unchristian. Persecution, in short, is not wrong *because* it is cruel, but it is cruel because it is wrong." P. 44.

We bring our extracts to an end with a sentence or two, full of truth, from the annotations on the fine essay on "Studies."

"The study of a book should be conducted nearly according to the same rule that Bacon lays down for the study of nature. He warns philosophers, earnestly and often, against substituting for what he calls the '*interrogatio naturæ*,' the 'anticipatio naturæ;' that is, instead of attentive observation and experiment, forming conjectures as to what seems to us *likely* or *fitting*, according to some hypothesis devised by ourselves. In like manner, in studying an author, you should keep *apart* interpretation and conjecture. * *

'As the fool thinketh,
So the bell chinketh.'

Perhaps he '*prays through*' all the Bible; not with a candid and teachable mind, seeking instruction, but unconsciously praying that he may *find himself in the right.* And he will seldom fail.

'Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.'

'In this book many students seek each one to find
The doctrine or precept that's most to his mind:
And each of them finds what they earnestly seek;
For as the fool thinks, even so the bells speak.'

* * But Nature and Revelation are to be interrogated not as *witnesses*, but as *instructors*. You must let all your conjectures *hang loose* upon you; and be prepared to learn *from* what is written in each of those volumes, with the aid of the conjectures of reason; not *from* reason (nor, by the bye, from feelings and fancies and wishes and human authority), with Scripture for your aid. This latter procedure, which is a very common one with theological students, may be called making an *anagram* of Scripture,—taking it to pieces and reconstructing it in the model of some human system of '*Institutes*;' building a temple of one's own, consisting of the stones of the true one pulled down and put together in a new fashion. Yet devices of this description are often considered by others as well as themselves pre-eminently scriptural, from their continual employment of the *very words* of Scripture, and their readiness in citing a profusion of texts. But in reality, instead of using a human *commentary* on Scripture, they use Scripture itself as a kind of commentary on some human system. They make the *warp* human, and interweave an abundance of Scripture as a *woof*, which is just the reverse of the right procedure. But this may be called, truly, in a certain sense, '*taking* a text *from* Scripture,' preaching such and such a doctrine '*out of* Scripture,' and '*improving* Scripture.'—Pp. 455, 456.

Unitarian Principles confirmed by Trinitarian Testimonies, being Selections from the Works of Eminent Theologians belonging to Orthodox Churches. With Introductory and Occasional Remarks. By John Wilson, Author of Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism. Cr. 8vo. Pp. 504. Boston—American Unitarian Association.

Many of our readers will remember an excellent book, published about fifteen years ago, by Mr. John Wilson, then a resident of Manchester, entitled the "Concessions of Trinitarians," designed to prove from the admissions even of "orthodox" writers the essential truth of Unitarianism. The idea was happy, and the execution of it was successful. The author of that work has now been many years resident in America. His present work is an enlargement of the introductory matter of his former work. But the new matter introduced so far exceeds that which the prefatory essay of the Concessions contained, that this may be truly represented as an original work. It consists of nine chapters, the subjects being—1. The Spirit of Sectarianism inconsistent with the Spirit of Christianity. 2. The Preciousness of Theological Truth and the unrestricted Means of acquiring it. 3. Reason and Revelation the only legitimate Standards of Religious Doctrine. 4. Christianity intelligible, rational and practical. 5. Trinitarianism either Unintelligible or Self-contradictory. 6. The Trinity in Unity and the Deity of Christ not Doctrines of Revelation. 7. God is One. The Father only the true God. 8. Jesus Christ inferior to God the Father. 9. The Holy Spirit not a Third Person in the Godhead, but God himself, or his Influence, Gifts, &c. In illustration of these important topics,

Mr. Wilson has brought together a series of passages—all weighty, some of them deeply interesting—from between 300 and 400 authors of the past and present age. An Unitarian library can scarcely possess a more useful book of reference than this. Hours of search would have been saved to us had we possessed it of old. Knowing, as we do by frequent reference to both his Illustrations and his Concessions, Mr. Wilson's fairness and accuracy, we confidently recommend this manual to all who take any interest in the Unitarian controversy. We have been much struck by the justness and force of many of the reflections with which Mr. Wilson follows up his extracts from "orthodox" writers. Here is a specimen, taken from the remarks on a concession by Neander:

"The doctrine of the Trinity is not a fundamental article of the Christian religion, for it is not expressed in any one passage of the New Testament Scriptures; but a belief in the only true God, and in Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, is the very foundation of Christianity, and pervades these writings. So says Neander. Should not, therefore, the 'Christian consciousness' accept the fundamental article of the Christian faith, which forms the great principle of Unitarianism, and reject the very idea of there being three persons, individuals, agents, beings, characters, or relations, in one God?"—P. 372.

The usefulness of this book is greatly increased by a very full Index.

Sermons by Alvan Lamson. Pp. 424. Boston—Crosby & Nichols.

Alvan Lamson is in the liberal churches of America a well-known and honoured name. A zealous ministerial life extending to nearly forty years' service,—occasional articles in the Christian Examiner, characterized by ability and patristic lore of rare extent and accuracy, have combined to win for him equal respect as a pastor and a theological writer. The interesting volume now before us will, we hope, make him well known in many English circles. The sermons are thoughtful and earnest,—sufficiently original to excite and sustain the reader's interest,—entirely free from affectation and extravagance,—composed in a pure and graceful style,—and, above all, devotional in feeling and Christian in doctrine. We will not expend the little space we have at present at our command by enumerating the subjects of the twenty-nine discourses that his volume contains, but prefer extracting a sentence or two which mark the author's pure moral sense and political courage. They are on the subject, so full of fearful interest to America, of Slavery.

"On these (viz. moral and Christian) grounds, slavery, as I view it, admits of no justification or defence. It is a great, intrinsic wrong, which should, the moment it is practicable, be done away,—be blotted out for ever from beneath the sun, as a thing hateful to God and man. It is a stain on the nation, so far as the nation sanctions it, which arrays against it the moral sentiment of the whole civilized world. And that sentiment is Christian, and will grow every day more and more earnest and decided. I say, so far as the nation sanctions it. I believe that the Fathers of our Republic never contemplated its permanent existence, its perpetuity. Some of them, we know, though themselves implicated, spoke of the holding of fellow-beings as property, subject to sale and purchase, as involving essential wrong and injustice; and from one of them, the writer of the Declaration of Independence, as it is well known, came the expression used in this connection, 'I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just!'"

OBITUARY.

Feb. 21, at his residence, in Calthorpe Street, Edgbaston, in his 52nd year, Mr. FREDERICK RYLAND, Surgeon. The Birmingham Journal of Saturday, Feb. 28, thus notices the removal of this excellent man:

Our obituary of this week records the death of another old and valued member of the medical profession, Mr. Frederick Ryland. Few have left behind them a larger circle of sincere and attached friends to deplore their loss, for he was a man distinguished not more by the powers of his mind than by the kindness of his heart and the warmth of his affections. Of late years the impaired state of his health compelled him to resign practice in connection with the public institutions of the town; had a larger share of physical power been allotted to him, his great abilities and varied acquirements, joined to a profound and thoroughly practical knowledge of his profession, would have secured for him a very high position as a surgeon.

Mr. Ryland was a member of an old and highly respectable family in Birmingham. He commenced his medical studies as apprentice to Mr. Badley, who still holds a deservedly eminent position in the profession at Dudley; he was also a dressing pupil, under Mr. Hodgson, at the General Hospital. His intelligence and industry at this early period of his career gained for him the esteem of both these gentlemen, and secured for him in after life their continued respect and friendship. He afterwards attended the schools of London and Paris. Soon after he had commenced practice in this his native town, he was elected in 1829 to the office of surgeon to the General Dispensary, an appointment which he early resigned, on his becoming one of the medical officers of the Town Infirmary. In this step he was "influenced solely (to use his own words) by a consideration of the impropriety and injustice of retaining two such important offices in his own hands." This latter appointment he held for seven years, and during this period he devoted himself to its laborious duties not only with great efficiency as regarded his patients, but with a determination to avail himself of the extensive opportunities it afforded for investigating the subject of medical statistics, both as applied to this town and also in its general relation to the influence of external conditions on the health of the community. In this important investigation he was associated with the late Mr. George Parsons, and with him supplied to the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association a series of reports on the out-patients of the Town Infirmary, which extend from 1834 to 1839, both years inclusive, and form a highly valuable contribution to sanitary science. They include elaborate tables of the various diseases he had been called upon to treat, with tables of mortality, of age, of sex, and of trade. The peculiar "constitution" of the year is noticed, the prevailing epidemics are enlarged upon, and special details are given of important cases; the author also enters upon the consideration of various circumstances which he had noticed as affecting the health of the town, and draws important conclusions respecting the relation of age, sex, and occupation to particular diseases.

In a similar report on the health of the children in the Asylum, he gives a graphic description of a fatal epidemic which came under his notice, and comments with much force on the various unfavourable influences to which the children in an Asylum are exposed. Nor were these the only contributions made by Mr. Ryland in connection with this subject; in 1841 he formed one of a Committee of Physicians and Surgeons employed by Government to inquire into the sanitary state of the labouring classes in the borough of Birmingham, an inquiry which issued in an important report; and at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in this town, in 1839, he took a share in the labour of preparing a paper on the Medical Statistics of Birmingham, founding his reports from the parish upon the cases of nearly 18,000 patients. The annual reports, too, of the Philosophical Institution are enriched by contributions from him of a similar character; and even in the course of his last illness he was meditating an investigation into the death rate of the town.

Subsequent to his holding the appointment in the Town Infirmary, which enabled him to carry out these important investigations, he filled the office of surgeon to the Eye Infirmary, and only retired from its duties when the state of his health compelled him to reside at Edgbaston. In 1835 he was the successful competitor for the Jacksonian Prize, offered by the Royal College of Surgeons,

the subject being "Diseases and Injuries of the Larynx and Trachea." This prize essay he subsequently expanded into a volume, which he enriched not only by extensive research into English and French authorities, but also by the results of his own observations in his infirmary practice, and the work still holds its place among the principal monographs in the English language on this important subject.

In many of our institutions unconnected with the medical profession, Mr. Ryland was at one time or other actively engaged. His interest in the Philosophical Institution was increased by the pleasure of co-operating with his old friend Mr. George Parsons, whose distinguished talents and extensive and accurate information Mr. Ryland highly appreciated, and of whom he always spoke with the warmest regard. He gave to the members of the Institution two interesting courses of lectures "On the Structure and Habits of Birds," and as one of its Fellows and a member of its Council, contributed not a little to maintain in connection with it that genial and liberal spirit by which it was so honourably distinguished during the many years of its useful and successful operation. Lench's Trust and the Graham-Street School also afforded to our friend a welcome field for the exercise of his benevolent sympathies, and his loss in regard to the appointments which he severally held in both these institutions is deeply felt by his colleagues, and sincerely deplored.

After Mr. Ryland had retired from the duties of public life, he devoted himself more closely to subjects connected with general literature. His reading had always been extensive, and by the aid of a powerful memory and a sound judgment, his mind was richly stored with information, and this, united to a fund of quiet humour, rendered his society everywhere acceptable. Those of his medical brethren who were united with him in the Social Medical Society, gratefully acknowledge how largely he contributed to the interest of their meetings, and how much their social enjoyment was enhanced by his geniality and friendly humour. As a medical man, no one was ever guided by a nicer sense of honour, both towards his professional brethren and his patients; nor was any one more uncompromising in maintaining his own standard of right. His life was indeed characterized throughout by an exalted and undeviating integrity; he was

"As just a man
As e'er my conversation coped withal."

Whilst studiously avoiding even the appearance of parade, and shrinking with a sensitive delicacy from all needless profession, no man was ever more firm and consistent in the avowal and maintenance of his convictions, whether in connection with those principles which he cherished and exercised as a student and a citizen, or with those sublimer principles which lay at the foundation of his faith as a Christian. Of his temper and behaviour in the domestic circle, no record will be required, while any survive who witnessed the manly fortitude with which he bore one of its severest sorrows, who have been blessed by his paternal counsels and influence, or enjoyed the privilege of his brotherly affection and disinterested friendship. The society of Christian worshipers of which he was, through life, an intelligent, consistent, and exemplary member, will long continue to regret his loss; and by all who knew him will his memory be cherished, as of one whose useful and honourable life is instructive and encouraging in the retrospect, and carries with it every practical sanction of the blessed hope of immortality.

Jan. 23, at Moreton Hampstead, in the 68th year of her age, after a long course of illness borne with much Christian resignation, Miss Mary Smale, highly esteemed and respected by a large circle of friends and relatives. She was of a kind and benevolent disposition, and delighted in doing good to the poor around her, who, while mourning her loss, speak of her with grateful remembrance. Her piety was of a cheerful but deepfelt character—more inward than outward. It was the great delight of her life, while she could do it, to take her place in the house of prayer; and one of the severest of her afflictions has latterly been her inability to do so. Her friend and pastor, while paying a tribute of respect to her memory, spoke of her as one whom he had known for more than forty years, and that in his estimation she was a truly good woman and a real Christian. It is painful to part with such; but we must not in these cases take counsel from our feelings or wishes, but mark the footsteps of the good, and follow them in the path which leadeth to the life eternal.